

VOLUME 3. Parts 4/6  
pp. 63—158

PARASITOLOGY, HELMINTHOLOGY,  
WINCHES FARM,  
395, HATFIELD ROAD,  
ST. ALBA 14th March 1950

# THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

16 MAR 1950

The Official Organ of

## THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

**FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.**

*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.*

### CONTENTS :

	Page
Part 1. Memoranda and Reports submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by the Secretary to the Commission at the Session of Meetings held by the International Commission during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 ( <i>concluded</i> )	63—154
Part 2. Communications submitted to the Section on Nomenclature, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 ( <i>first instalment</i> )	Half-Title, 157—158

### LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological  
Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth  
International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,  
and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the  
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature  
at the Publications Office of the Trust  
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(All rights reserved)





regarded as a junior synonym is found to have priority over the currently used name when that name is reclassified as from the later date from which it will now rank for purposes of priority.

33. Against these sacrifices must be set the great advantages that will be reaped by both classes of zoologist. Those who attach importance to the giving of names to taxonomic units below the rank of subspecies will secure for such names a definite recognition in the *Règles* and will be provided with a code of rules by which the status of such names can in future be regulated. On the other hand, those zoologists who are not concerned with the study of forms of lower rank than subspecies will not only be able to disregard all such names as may in future be published for forms of these categories, but will also be able forthwith to discard many thousands of names which at present encumber their catalogues.

34. In my view, the sacrifices to be made are infinitely less than the advantages to be gained. Even if this were not so, these sacrifices and inconveniences would be a small price to pay for a settlement which put an end to doubt and uncertainty and removed the reproach that zoologists would prefer the continuance of a state of chaos rather than make the small mutual sacrifices necessary to introduce order into this important field of zoological nomenclature. It is therefore with confidence and hope that I place in the hands of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature the present Report on the subject which they entrusted to me at their meeting held at Lisbon in 1935.

#### SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

35. I summarise my principal conclusions and recommendations as follows:—

- (1) The lowest taxonomic category mentioned in the *Règles* is the “sous-espèce” (subspecies). That term is not defined and many zoologists claim that, in the absence of a definition, this expression, as used in the *Règles*, should be interpreted as comprising every infra-specific category and not merely populations which differ constantly from one another within a given species. This view is rejected by many other zoologists, who, however, do not agree with one another as to the criteria to be adopted for determining whether a given trivial name should be regarded as the trivial name of a subspecies or should be rejected as the name of a form of infra-subspecific rank. The problem here is whether this question should be determined (a) by the terms in which the name was first published or (b) by the subjective taxonomic views on the status of the form concerned held by the worker using the name in question.
- (2) The lack of guidance in the *Règles* on the foregoing questions has led to much confusion and diversity of practice. In order to put an end to this state of affairs, it is essential that the Congress should agree to insert words in the *Règles* to make it clear:—

- (a) whether the lowest category of name to which those *Règles* apply is the subspecies (as currently understood); or
  - (b) whether, on the contrary, the *Règles* apply to names bestowed on any class of infra-specific unit down to, and including, a name given to a unique individual aberration.
- (3) It is clear that no solution would be acceptable which denied to the names of infra-subspecific forms the rights conferred by the Law of Priority (Article 25) or excluded such names from the scope of the Law of Homonymy (Articles 35 and 36). It is equally clear that no solution would be acceptable which granted an absolute parity to names bestowed upon infra-subspecific forms with names bestowed upon subspecies and species. The following proposals are designed to meet the practical needs both of those zoologists whose requirements are such that they should have at their disposal names for taxonomic units of infra-subspecific rank and of those zoologists who feel no such need.
- (4) As a first step towards a settlement of the nomenclatorial problems involved, it is essential that the *Règles* should expressly recognise the existence for nomenclatorial purposes of two categories below the species level and should give a clear definition of the meaning to be applied for nomenclatorial purposes to each of these categories. It is suggested that the expressions to be applied in the *Règles* to denote these categories and the definitions to be given to them should be as follows:—
- |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| “Subspecies”             | A geographical, ecological or other population within a species which differs constantly from another such population within the same species.   |
| “Infra-subspecific form” | Any form of a species other than a “subspecies” as defined above. This term would therefore include seasonal forms and minority elements of all kinds within a species, such as sexual forms, transition forms, mutants, aberrations, etc. |
- (5) Great instability would inevitably arise if the nomenclatorial status of a given name were to depend upon the subjective view of zoologists on the question whether a given name applied to a subspecies or to an infra-subspecific form. It is essential therefore that the *Règles* should provide an objective criterion, namely, that provided by the terms in which the name was originally published.
- (6) It is not possible to devise a generally acceptable solution which would apply not only to names given in the future but also to names given in the past. It is therefore suggested that (as on the occasion in 1927 when a new proviso was added to Article 25) the Congress should provide two standards for names published for units of less than specific rank to acquire status as subspecific names, one, more lenient, to be applied to names already published, and another, more rigorous, standard for names published in the future.



- (7) It is desirable that adequate notice should be given to zoologists of the new provisions and it is therefore suggested that the point of time to be selected as that from which the more rigorous standard should be applied should be midnight G.M.T., 31st December 1950/1st January 1951.
- (8) In order to ensure against the risk of names being invalidated on purely technical grounds, it is essential to avoid introducing unduly detailed conditions into the standards to be prescribed. The standard to be prescribed should therefore be a minimum standard. In order, however, to provide a guide to the highest standard to be aimed at, a *Recommendation* prescribing that standard should be added to the relevant new provision in the *Règles*.
- (9) It is proposed :—
- (a) that any trivial name published, prior to the point of time specified in (7) above, as the name of a taxonomic unit of less than specific rank shall be classified for the purposes of the *Règles* as follows :—
    - (i) as the trivial name of a subspecies, when at the time of the original publication of the name the author concerned either (1) clearly indicated that he regarded the unit named as of subspecific rank or (2) did not clearly indicate the status attributed by him to the form so named, that is to say, whether he regarded it as being a subspecies or as being a form of infra-subspecific rank ;
    - (ii) as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form, only when at the time of the original publication of the name the author concerned expressly indicated that he regarded the form so named as being a form of infra-subspecific rank.
  - (b) that any trivial name published, after the point of time specified in (7) above, as the name of a taxonomic unit of less than specific rank shall be classified for the purposes of the *Règles* as follows :—
    - (i) as the trivial name of a subspecies, only when, at the time of the original publication of the name, the author concerned clearly indicated that he regarded the form so named as being a subspecies ;
    - (ii) as the trivial name of a form of infra-subspecific rank, in all cases where, at the time of the original publication of the name, the author concerned either expressly indicated that he regarded the form so named as being a form of infra-subspecific rank or, if he did not so indicate the status of the form, where he failed to indicate clearly that he regarded that form as being a subspecies.
  - (c) that a *Recommendation* be added to the provision in the *Règles* dealing with the matters specified in (b) above, strongly recommending that an author when proposing a trivial name for a

previously unnamed subspecies or, when re-naming a subspecies, the only published name for which is invalid under Article 35, should cite that name in a trinomial combination (consisting of (1) the generic name (2) the specific trivial name and (3) the subspecific trivial name) and further that, by using the expression "ssp.n." or otherwise, he should clearly indicate both that the name is a new name and that it is intended to apply to a subspecies.

- (10) It is essential that the *Règles* should distinguish clearly between the status of a name originally published as the name of a subspecies and that of a name originally published as the name of an infra-subspecific form. It is therefore suggested that the *Règles* should provide:—
- (a) that (as at present) the trivial names of subspecies shall be co-ordinate with the trivial names of species ;
  - (b) that a name given to any infra-subspecific form shall be co-ordinate with the name given to any other infra-subspecific form but not with names of subspecies and species ;
  - (c) that a name originally published as the name of an infra-subspecific form, if elevated to subspecific or specific rank by a subsequent reviser, shall rank in its new status for purposes of priority as from the date on which it was so elevated and shall be attributed to the author by whom it was so elevated ;
  - (d) that for the purposes of (c) above, an author need not expressly state that he is elevating the status of a name originally published as the name of an infra-subspecific form but he must so treat the name as to make it clear that he is in fact treating that name as the name of a subspecies ;
  - (e) that, in order to obtain as high a standard of clarity as practicable, it is most desirable that every author, when elevating to subspecific rank a name originally published as the name of an infra-subspecific form, should expressly state that he is so doing, and a *Recommandation* to this effect should be inserted in the Article of the *Règles* containing the provisions specified in (c) and (d) above ;
  - (f) that, where a name, originally published as the name of an infra-subspecific form is elevated to subspecific rank under (c) above but some other author does not recognise the taxonomic validity of the action taken by the previous reviser and in consequence continues to regard the animal in question as representing not a subspecies but an infra-subspecific form, the name for any such author shall retain its original priority and shall be attributed to its original author ;
  - (g) that, where a name originally published as the name of a species or subspecies is treated by a subsequent reviser as applying to an infra-subspecific form, the name shall retain its original priority and shall be attributed to its original author.



- (11) As regards the citation of names of infra-subspecific forms, it is necessary that provision should be made in the *Règles* for some method of citation different from that prescribed for subspecies. It is therefore suggested that the *Règles* should provide that, when an author desires to cite by name an infra-subspecific form, he should cite that name immediately after the trivial name of the species, if no subspecific name is to be cited, and immediately after the subspecific trivial name, if a subspecific name is to be cited, provided :—
- (a) that a comma be inserted immediately after the trivial name of the species or the subspecies, as the case may be ; and
  - (b) that an expression indicating the status of the infra-subspecific form in question (e.g. an expression such as "form.vern.," "♀-form," or "ab.") be inserted immediately before the name of the infra-subspecific form.
- (12) Consequent upon the introduction into the *Règles* of a prescribed manner of citing names of forms of infra-subspecific rank (as recommended in (11) above), it is desirable that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a *Recommendation* regarding the manner in which such names should be originally published parallel to that suggested in (9) (c) above in the case of names of subspecific rank. It is accordingly suggested that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a *Recommendation* strongly recommending that an author when proposing a trivial name for a previously unnamed form of infra-subspecific rank or when renaming such a form, the only published name for which is invalid under Article 35, should cite that name in the manner specified in (11) above.
- (13) Subject to (10) and (11) above, all the provisions in the *Règles* which apply to the trivial names of species and subspecies should apply also to the trivial names of infra-subspecific forms.
- (14) In order to prevent the confusion which might arise (and to remove the confusion which in certain instances has already arisen) when different names are applied to parallel infra-subspecific forms occurring in two or more allied species, it is suggested that the *Règles* should provide that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, acting on behalf of the International Congress of Zoology, may, on the application of specialists in the groups concerned, use their plenary powers to establish technical designations to be applied to such parallel forms, such designations :—
- (a) to consist of Latin or Latinised words or words treated as such ; and
  - (b) to comply with the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the formation of specific and subspecific trivial names,
- and that, where a given term has been prescribed under the foregoing procedure to be the technical designation of a parallel form occurring in two or more allied species, the term so prescribed shall have absolute priority over :—

- (i) any name which may already have been, or may thereafter be given to that form in any of the species concerned, and
- (ii) any other use of the same word as the name of any other infraspecific form of any species in the same genus or, if more than one genus is covered by the order made by the International Commission, in the genera so covered.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the Commission,  
London, England.

14th July, 1948.



# INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

## PAPER

I.C.(48)10

### PROPOSED CODIFICATION OF THE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE "RÈGLES" GIVEN IN "OPINIONS" RENDERED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

*Memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission*

Since the year 1907 when the International Congress of Zoology conferred upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature the right and the duty to render *Opinions* on questions of nomenclature submitted to it, the Commission has rendered in all 194 *Opinions* covering a wide variety of subjects. In addition, the Commission has rendered 12 *Declarations*, embodying decisions of a more general character, mostly concerned with nomenclatorial practice rather than with nomenclature itself, which have formed the subject of Resolutions adopted at successive meetings of the Commission and the Congress.

2. Many of the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission are concerned either with the status of individual names or with the addition of names to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology." But when we put those *Opinions* on one side (as being irrelevant to our present purpose), we are left with a substantial body of *Opinions*, each of which contains an interpretation of the meaning to be attached to some Article of the *Règles*. Some of these *Opinions* were expressly drafted as interpretative *Opinions* but in most cases the interpretation is given more or less incidentally in connection with an answer to a question regarding the status of a particular name. In these cases the title of the *Opinion* relates to the name under discussion and gives no indication that a decision of principle affecting every zoologist has been given in the *Opinion* in question. Not unnaturally, therefore, some of these interpretations have been widely overlooked.

3. At their Session held in Lisbon in 1935 the International Commission reviewed their practice in this matter (Lisbon Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 15) and unanimously agreed that, when in future the Commission reached a decision of interest to the general body of zoologists, it was of the utmost importance that that decision should be presented in such a way as to ensure that it was most readily available to all concerned. This decision has been strictly applied on every occasion on which since 1935 this problem has arisen. An example of the application of this principle is provided by the case submitted to the Commission in regard to the status of the Brachiopod name *Rhynchonella*

*alta* commonly attributed to Samuel Calvin and treated as having been published in or about 1878. The question put to the Commission was concerned with the status of the trivial name *alta*, but in order to reach a decision on this question it was necessary for the Commission to take a decision regarding the interpretation of proviso (a) to Article 25 of the *Règles* in relation to a name, the alleged "publication" of which consisted of its use in explanation of a photograph or other illustration distributed by a zoologist to his students or his colleagues. In this case the Commission gave their decision on the status of the name *Rhynchonella alta* (a matter of interest only to students of the Class Brachiopoda) in one *Opinion* (*Opinion* 190), while they gave their interpretation of this particular aspect of Article 25 in another *Opinion* (*Opinion* 191).

4. The reformed procedure instituted by the Commission in 1935 was undoubtedly a great improvement on that previously followed, but it touched only the fringe of the subject. Much more drastic steps will be necessary before an end can be put to the chaotic situation which confronts zoologists who desire to ascertain whether any particular provision of the *Règles* has been the subject of an interpretative *Opinion* by the International Commission. The first two tasks to be undertaken are first to make available the texts of the older *Opinions*, most of which are out of print and are virtually unobtainable; the second to provide some guide by which zoologists can thread their way through the jungle presented by those *Opinions* in their present unindexed state.

5. When during the recent war the Commission endeavoured to take stock of the problems with which they were faced and which they would need to tackle immediately the war was over, they expressly included in their programme the publication of an authoritative edition of the substantive French text of the *Règles*. In making this announcement in their Report for the year 1944 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: lxvi-lxvii) the Commission added that they proposed to include in the new edition of the *Règles* an analysis of those of their *Opinions* which contained interpretations of Articles of the *Règles*. This analysis was started in 1944 and was substantially completed some two years later. Its preparation proved laborious and in some respects difficult owing to the need carefully to distinguish the actual decisions taken by the Commission from the numerous *obiter dicta* embodied in the texts of many *Opinions* which had the appearance of being views expressed by the Commission but were in fact no more than the personal views of the draftsmen of the *Opinions* concerned.

6. Simultaneously with the preparation of the analysis of the interpretative *Opinions* rendered by the Commission, a start was made with the re-issue of the older *Opinions* which (as already explained) had for years been out of print and which were unknown to the majority of zoologists, except through the "summaries" which often failed to give a clear picture of the decision taken in those cases where the ostensible object of the *Opinion* was to give a ruling on the status of some particular name, while by far the most important part of the *Opinion* was the decision taken on the interpretation of some provision of the *Règles*. Attached to each of these re-issues were editorial notes prepared by myself in my capacity as Secretary to the Commission.



7. Both the projected analysis of the interpretative *Opinions* and the issue of an annotated edition of the older *Opinions* represented steps in the right direction but each fell short of the ideal solution, for neither the analysis nor the annotations to the older *Opinions* could in the circumstances do more than represent the views of the author by whom they were compiled. However careful and objective the approach made to this task, it is obvious that documents compiled in this way were liable to contain conclusions which might be open to discussion. Obviously, it was desirable to secure, if possible, an analysis and annotations which represented the views of the whole Commission and whose authority could therefore not be called in question.

8. Within the last eighteen months the whole question has been carefully reviewed by the Executive Committee who have come to the conclusion that the right and proper course is to take advantage of the forthcoming meeting of the International Congress of Zoology to seek the concurrence of the Congress in a comprehensive codification of the interpretative *Opinions* rendered by the Commission during the last forty years. In every country in which the law consists partly of statute law and partly of case law built up from interpretative judicial decisions it is the normal practice from time to time to take stock of the position and to codify the law by writing into the statute the provisions which over the course of years have themselves become part of the general corpus of the law through interpretations of the statute made in the Courts. There is obvious advantage to be gained from periodical codifications of this sort, for, unless action is taken on these lines, the law becomes so complicated (and often to the laymen so obscure) that it is impossible for any but skilled jurists to interpret it with any confidence. Ultimately, even expert interpretations so prepared themselves become open to an increasing measure of reservation and doubt, owing to the fact that, as is inevitable over a long period, judicial decisions taken at one date on a particular question are found on close examination to be—or to have the appearance of being—inconsistent with decisions taken at some earlier date on some closely allied topic. There is therefore a real danger that if matters are allowed to slide indefinitely the state of the law will become so obscure as almost to defy interpretation.

9. Fortunately, matters have not yet reached such a pass in the case of the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique*, but signs are not wanting that the *Règles* and the *Opinions* taken together are becoming so complicated as to make their interpretation by working zoologists unnecessarily time-consuming and burdensome. As a preliminary to bringing forward the present proposal, I have held numerous consultations with leading specialists and the answers received have been uniformly encouraging. The Executive Committee are confident, therefore, not only that a codification of the *Opinions* by the making of appropriate additions to the *Règles* is long overdue and is now urgently required, but also that a stocktaking of this kind will be generally welcomed by zoologists.

10. A codification of the international law of zoological nomenclature of the kind now proposed offers the further great advantage that when this reform has been carried through, but not before, it will be possible for zoologists at

large and for the Commission in particular to review the whole position and to consider in what directions further elucidations are required. At the same time zoologists will be able to consider, in conditions infinitely more favourable than those obtaining today, whether any, and, if so, what, changes should be made in the existing provisions of the law.

11. As explained in the Agenda Paper for the Paris Meeting (Paper I.C. (48) 1 already circulated), the proposal now put before the Commission is that they should submit to the Section of Nomenclature of the Congress concrete proposals regarding the interpretative decisions taken in *Opinions* by the Commission which it is now desired should be incorporated in the *Règles*. It is not proposed that those propositions should be put forward in the form of suggested additions to the *Règles*, for the task of drafting such provisions involves a technical skill which neither the Commission nor the Congress possesses or could reasonably be expected to possess. Such a task can only properly be performed by skilled jurists and it is part of the present proposal that this task should be remitted to experts by whom alone it can properly be discharged. It is essential, however, that the instructions to be given to the jurists should be in the most unequivocal form and for this reason it is most important that the propositions to be submitted by the Commission to the Section on Nomenclature should be drawn in the clearest possible terms.

12. What has been done, therefore, is to take the interpretative *Opinions* rendered by the Commission, to arrange them in order by reference to the Articles of the *Règles* to which they refer, and to draw up in respect of each of these *Opinions* a proposition to be submitted to the Section on Nomenclature. These propositions are set out in Paper I.C. (48) 11. In each case a reference is given to the *Opinion* or *Opinions* on which the proposition in question is based.

13. The list of propositions given in the paper referred to above is intended to be a complete list of all the interpretations of the *Règles* hitherto given by the Commission in their *Opinions*, except for such interpretations in regard to one or two particular provisions (for example, the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire") which will form the subject of separate proposals to be submitted to the Commission during the Paris meeting. Where separate action of this kind is contemplated, an explanatory note has been added at the appropriate point in the paper now submitted as Paper I.C. (48) 11.

14. It is possible that it will be found either that the list now submitted is not fully exhaustive or that there may be passages in some of the older *Opinions* which have been treated by some zoologists as containing decisions on questions of principle which have not been so regarded in the preparation of the present list. I shall be particularly grateful to any member of the Commission who may find an apparent omission of this kind if he will be so good as at once to bring it to my attention so that I may have an opportunity of considering the point raised and of putting before the Commission a proposal in regard thereto.

15. Once the proposed codification has been effected, it would clearly be highly remiss if the Commission were ever again to permit a recurrence of the present state of affairs. The Executive Committee accordingly propose that



for the future the Commission, when called upon to give an *Opinion* interpreting a given provision of the *Règles*, should not only do so in the clearest and most categorical terms (in accordance with the decision which they took at Lisbon, to which reference has been made in paragraph 3 of the present paper) but also that they should expressly state that it is their intention to recommend the International Congress of Zoology at its next meeting to approve the incorporation in the *Règles* of words to give effect to the interpretation given in the *Opinion* in question.

16. The Executive Committee propose that the Commission should take the following additional measures to prevent the recurrence of uncertainty regarding the state of international law in regard to zoological nomenclature :—

- (1) *As regards "Opinions" already rendered (that is to say, "Opinions" 1 to 194):* to repeal every such *Opinion*, in so far as that *Opinion* contains an interpretation of the *Règles* and the present International Congress of Zoology decides either that that interpretation be now incorporated in the *Règles* or superseded by some other provision, this repeal to take effect as from the date of publication of the *Règles* as amended by the present meeting of the Congress ;
- (2) to request any zoologist who may consider that any *Opinion*, other than an *Opinion* repealed for interpretative purposes in accordance with (1) above, contains an interpretation of the *Règles* which through inadvertence has either not been incorporated in the *Règles* as part of the present codification or has not been expressly repealed to notify the International Commission as soon as possible, so that they may consider what recommendations in regard thereto to submit to the next meeting of the Congress ;
- (3) to place on record their intention :—
  - (a) to make proposals to the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress for the incorporation in the *Règles* of any interpretation thereof given in any *Opinion* so far rendered which they may find was inadvertently not incorporated in the *Règles* by direction of the present meeting of the Congress and which they may deem it expedient should be so incorporated ;
  - (b) to repeal, in so far as concerns the interpretation of the *Règles*, every *Opinion* so far rendered which may not already have been repealed in accordance with (1) above, as from the date of the publication, subsequent to the next meeting of the Congress, of the *Règles*, as amended at that Congress ;
- (4) *As regards any "Opinions" rendered after the present meeting of the Congress:—*
  - (a) to lay it down that the decision given in any such *Opinion* is to be looked for only in the "summary" of that *Opinion*, that every such "summary" is to be rigidly construed and that no deductions, other than those expressly specified therein, are to be drawn therefrom ;

- (b) to place on record that no new interpretation of the *Règles* is to be drawn from any *Opinion*, other than an *Opinion* in which the Commission expressly state, in the "summary" thereof, that they are giving such an interpretation ;
  - (c) to report to each meeting of the Congress any interpretation of the *Règles* which they may have given in an *Opinion* rendered since the last previous meeting of the Congress, with a recommendation that every such interpretation be incorporated in the *Règles* ;
  - (d) to place on record their intention to repeal any *Opinion* the contents of which shall have been incorporated in the *Règles* by direction of a meeting of the Congress, acting on a recommendation submitted to it in accordance with (c) above, the said repeal to take effect as from the date of the publication, subsequent to the said meeting of the Congress, of the *Règles*, as amended at that Congress ;
- (5) to incorporate in the By-laws of the Commission the provisions specified in (4) above.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the Commission,  
London, England.  
12th July, 1948.



## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

## PAPER

I.C.(48)11

INTERPRETATIONS OF THE "RÈGLES" GIVEN IN "OPINIONS" RENDERED  
BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION:  
PROPOSALS IN REGARD TO CODIFICATION

---

*Memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission*

The following is a list of the interpretations of Articles of the *Règles* given in *Opinions* rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, together with proposals regarding the action to be taken in regard to their incorporation in the *Règles*. For reasons of convenience, the interpretations in question are listed by reference not to the order in which they were promulgated by the Commission but to the Articles of the *Règles* with which they are concerned.

**List of interpretations of the "Règles" promulgated in "Opinions" rendered by the International Commission**

1. *Article 4*: Words to be inserted to make it clear that, as laid down in *Opinion 133*, as elaborated in *Opinion 141*, the following principles are to be observed in interpreting this Article:

- (a) The oldest available generic name in a family need not be taken as the type genus of that family.
- (b) An author establishing a new family is free to select as the type genus of that family whatever generic unit he considers the most appropriate.
- (c) The name of a family is based upon the name of its type genus. The fact that a given generic name is selected to form the name of a family constitutes *ipso facto* a definite designation of that genus as the type genus of that family. *Example*: The genus *Musca* Linnaeus, 1758, is definitely and unambiguously designated as the type genus of the family MUSCIDAE by reason of the stem of the word *Musca* being used in the formation of the family name.
- (d) The foregoing principles apply to the names of subfamilies in like manner as to those of families.

2. A *Recommandation* to be added in the following sense to the provision indicated in (b) above: "So far as possible, the genus selected to be the type genus of a family should be the best known and commonest of the taxonomic units concerned, i.e. it should be the most central of the genera proposed to be included in the family so established." (See note to point (2) in summary of *Opinion 141*.)

3. A *Recommandation* to be added in the following sense to the provision indicated in (c) above: "In view of the fact that there are well-established family names proposed by early authors where the principle indicated in (c) above has not been observed but where it is undesirable that existing practice should be changed, authors should refer to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature any case which appears to fall in this class before changing such a name." (See note to point (3) in summary of *Opinion* 141.)

4. *Article* 8: Words to be inserted to make it clear that, as laid down in *Opinion* 183:

The provision in this Article that a generic name is to consist of a noun in the nominative singular requires that no name is to be accepted as a generic name until it has been published in that case and number and that a name first published in some other case and/or number is therefore available as a generic name only as from the date on which it is for the first time published in the nominative singular.

5. *Article* 14, *paragraph* (1): Words to be inserted to make it clear that, as laid down in *Opinion* 64, serial letters such as "a," "b," "c," etc., are not to be accepted as constituting trivial names of species or subspecies within the meaning of this paragraph of Article 14.

6. *Article* 14, *paragraph* (3): The ruling given by the Commission in regard to this paragraph in their *Opinion* 8 is the subject of a recommendation submitted in Paper **I.C.(48)6** (paragraph 11).

7. *Article* 19: Various proposals are under consideration for the amendment of this Article. This is no reason, however, why decisions already taken by the International Commission in *Opinions* rendered at various times should not be incorporated forthwith in the *Règles*. Indeed, until this is done it will not be possible to judge the nature and extent of the amendments (if any) which are desirable.

8. In *Opinion* 26 it is stated in the text that: "In general, it seems clear that the evidence [whether or not a *faute d'orthographe*, a *faute de transcription* or a *faute d'impression* is *évident*] must be contained in the original article and must be of such a nature that it is apparent to workers unacquainted with local conditions and local names" but this cannot be regarded as a definitive interpretation of Article 19, for in the "summary" of that *Opinion* the Commission ruled that it was "*évident*" that a given name (published by Swainson) was incorrectly spelt and should be amended "in view of the number of typographical errors in Swainson, 1838 and 1839." Moreover the proposition quoted above from *Opinion* 26 was subsequently abandoned by the Commission in *Opinions* 41, 61 and 63. It may be concluded however that in *Opinion* 26 the Commission ruled that, in deciding whether in any given case a "*faute*" is "*évident*," particular attention should be paid to evidence contained in the book or journal in which the name was first published. It is desirable that words should be added to the *Règles* to make this clear.

9. The other rulings given by the Commission in regard to the interpretation of Article 19 deal with particular cases (*Opinions* 27, 29, 36, 41, 60, 61 and 63). Some of these rulings could conveniently be incorporated in the *Règles* as



examples of cases where a *faute d'orthographe*, or a *faute de transcription* or a *faute d'impression* is "évident." But care will need to be taken to ensure that the generality of the expression "évident" is not circumscribed by the insertion of these examples. The rulings in question lay down the following propositions, which it is suggested should now be incorporated in an appropriate manner in the *Règles*:

- (a) Where a scientific name is based upon a modern patronymic and evidence of such dedication is "évident" and where the spelling of the scientific name so published is not identical, except for the termination, with the spelling of the name of the person to whom the genus or species is dedicated, the spelling of the scientific name is to be corrected so as to correspond with the spelling of the name of that person. *Example*: *Ruppelia* Swainson, 1839, and *Rupellia* Swainson, 1839, are to be amended to *Rüppellia*, in view of the fact that this genus was dedicated to Rüppell. (*Opinion* 27.)
- (b) When the author of a new name expressly founds that name upon one or more Greek words but inadvertently commits an error in transliterating into the Latin alphabet one or more of the Greek letters comprised in the word or words of which the name was composed, the error of transcription is to be corrected. *Example*: The erroneous transliteration of the Greek letter Zeta as though it stood for the Latin letter "x" instead of the Latin letter "z" committed in the spelling "Pentoxocera" is to be corrected and the spelling of this name emended to "Pentozocera." (*Opinion* 36.)
- (c) When an author founds a name upon one or more Greek words cited in the original publication and where one of those words is there incorrectly spelt and in consequence the scientific name founded thereon is also incorrectly spelt, the spelling of that name is to be corrected. *Example*: The authors of the generic name which originally appeared as "*Athlennes*" stated that that name was based upon a Greek word similarly spelt (i.e., having the Greek letter Theta as its second letter). In fact, however, the Greek word concerned had as its second letter the letter Beta. This generic name should therefore have been spelt *Ablennes* and is to be emended accordingly. (*Opinion* 41.)
- (d) When an author founds a trivial name upon the name of a locality or district from which the type specimen was obtained but, as the result of his misreading or miscopying that name from the label on the type specimen, publishes as the trivial name of the species a Latinised word which fails to indicate the locality or district intended, the trivial name is to be corrected. *Example*: A fish was given the name *Leuciscus hakuensis* by Günther because he misread the label on the type specimen as indicating that it had been taken in "Lake Hakou." In fact, however, the name of the locality was "Lake Hakone." The trivial name *hakuensis* is therefore to be emended to *hakonensis*. (*Opinion* 63.)

- (e) When the author of a new specific name selects for the trivial name of the species a word which, though adjectival in form, is not a recognised Latin adjective and where the author uses for the nominative singular of that word the termination “-ius” (masculine) or “-ia” (feminine), these terminations are to be corrected to “-eus” and “-ea” respectively. *Example*: The word *iridia* published in 1855 as the trivial name for a new species of the genus *Salmo* is to be emended to *iridea* or, in the masculine, to *irideus* (*Opinion* 60).

10. *Article 25 (names based upon hypothetical forms)*: Words to be inserted to make it clear (as laid down in *Opinion* 2) that names based upon hypothetical forms have no status under the Law of Priority. *Example*: *Pithecanthropus* Haeckel, 1866, being the name of a genus based upon a hypothetical species, has no rights under the Law of Priority, and does not preoccupy the generic name *Pithecanthropus* Dubois, [1894], which is based upon a known species.

11. *Article 25 (a specific name bestowed conditionally)*: Words to be inserted to make it clear that, where an author doubtfully identifies known material with a described species but publishes for that material a new specific name in case it is later found to be referable to an unnamed species, the specific name, so given conditionally, is available for that species as from the date of its being so published. *Example*: The name *Siphonophora asclepiadifolii*, given conditionally by Thomas in 1879 to material doubtfully identified by him with a previously named species (*Aphis asclepiadis* Fitch) is available as from 1879 for the material so named by Thomas. (*Opinion* 49.)

12. *Article 25 (names which prior to publication were manuscript names)*: Words to be inserted to make it clear that a manuscript name acquires standing under the Law of Priority when published in conditions which comply with the provisos to *Article* 25, and that the status of such a name is not affected by the question whether the author by whom it is published accepts it as an available name or sinks it as a synonym. (*Opinion* 4.)

13. *Article 25 (meaning of the expression “divulgué dans une publication”)*: Important interpretations of the expression “divulgué dans une publication” have been given by the Commission in *Opinions* 15 and 51. These interpretations certainly need to be incorporated in the *Règles*. It is desirable, however, that these interpretations should be expanded slightly before this is done. This question is accordingly not dealt with here but will form the subject of a recommendation submitted in Paper I.C.(48)14.<sup>5</sup>

14. *Article 25 (status of names in documents, etc., distributed to colleagues or students)*: Words to be inserted to make it clear that a new name introduced in a note (whether printed or otherwise reproduced) in explanation of a photograph or other illustration of an animal is not “divulgué dans une publication” where the author concerned does no more than distribute copies of such a note and photograph or other illustration to colleagues or students or when he merely attaches copies of such a note and illustration to separates of a paper dealing with the same subject but not containing the new name in question. (*Opinion* 191.) *Example*: The name *Rhynchonella alta* has no status under

<sup>5</sup> See Point (26) in Commission Paper I.C. (48)14.



*Article 25* as from the date (about 1878) on which it was distributed in a note with accompanying photograph by Samuel Calvin but ranks for purposes of priority as from 1890 when it was published with an indication by H. S. Williams. (*Opinion 190.*)

15. *Article 25 (status of names appearing in proof sheets)*: Words to be inserted to make it clear that the distribution of proof sheets does not constitute publication and that a new name given currency in this way has no status under the Law of Priority until such later time as it is duly published in accordance with the provisions of *Article 25*. (*Opinion 87.*)

16. *Article 25 (status of a generic name published as an emendation of a previously published name)*: Words to be inserted to make it clear that a generic name published as an emendation, other than a valid emendation made under *Article 19*, of a name of the same origin and meaning is to be rejected as a synonym of the earlier name (*Opinion 148*). This decision carries with it the corollary that, if the earlier published name is found to be a homonym, the emended name is available as from the date on which it was published, and it would be well to make this point clear. (The example given in *Opinion 148* is that of *Achatinus* de Montfort, 1810, which is to be treated as a synonym of *Achatina* Lamarck, 1799, of which it is an invalid emendation.)

17. *Article 25 (status of names published in advance separates)*: Words to be inserted to make it clear that, where a new name appears in a paper published in a journal, and separates of that paper are distributed in advance of the publication of the paper in the journal concerned, the new name ranks not from the date of the distribution of the separates but from the later date on which the paper was actually published in the journal. *Example*: The Trematode name *Amphimerus* Barker does not date from the appearance of the *tirés à part* but from the date of issue of "Studies from the Zoological Laboratory," the University of Nebraska, No. 103 (which preceded the publication of the paper in question in the *Archives de Parasitologie*, for which it was printed). (*Opinion 59.*)

18. *Article 25, Proviso (a) (meaning of expression "indication")*: This question was the subject of an interpretation given in *Opinion 1*. In that *Opinion* the Commission dealt separately with the question as it affects the trivial names of species and as it affects generic names. In Paper I.C.(48)7 proposals as regards generic names are being put before the Commission to insert a provision in the *Règles* in the opposite sense from that which would be required if the interpretation given in *Opinion 1* were now to be codified. It is accordingly not proposed to deal with this question in the present paper. The portion of *Opinion 1* which relates to the trivial names of species should, however, now be incorporated in the *Règles*. This will involve the insertion of words to make it clear that the trivial name of a species is to be treated as having been published with an "indication" when it is published with a bibliographical reference to a previously published description or when it is published with a figure (illustration) or when it is published as a substitute for a previously published name.

19. *Article 25, Proviso (a) (status of specific names described jointly with generic names)*: Words to be inserted to make it clear that, in accordance with *Opinion 43*, a specific name published, prior to 1st January, 1931, jointly with a new generic name is to be treated as having been published with an "indication," where the new genus and the new species are described jointly, no separate description being given for either. (The terms of the actual decision by the Commission in the foregoing *Opinion* are: "The characters given for *Teleogmus* Foerster, 1856, *Isoplate* Foerster, 1856, *Alloderma* Ashmead, 1904, and *Aphobetoideus* Ashmead, 1904, cover the genera and the type species, and the generic and specific names are published in the sense of the Code.") It is necessary to limit this amendment to names published before 1st January, 1931, for names published in the foregoing manner would not satisfy the requirements of proviso (c) added to Article 25 with effect from that date.

20. *Article 25, Proviso (a) (significance of citation of a type locality)*: Words to be inserted to make it clear that, as laid down in *Opinion 52*, the citation of a type locality, unaccompanied by any other particulars, does not constitute the giving of an "indication" for the purposes of Proviso (a) to Article 25, but that, if specific characters are given in addition to the name of the type locality, the type locality becomes a part of the description and is to be considered an important element in determining the identity of the species.

21. *Article 25, Proviso (b) (status of names originally published before the publication of the 10th edition of the Systema Naturae)*: Words to be added to make it clear that a name which has no status under the *Règles* because it was published prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature in 1758 (Article 26) does not acquire status under the *Règles* if, when republished after the publication of the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus, it is simply reprinted with its original diagnosis, it being necessary, in order that such a name should acquire rights under the *Règles*, that it should be re-inforced by being adopted or accepted by the author responsible for republishing the name (*Opinion 5*).

22. *Article 25, Proviso (b) (meaning of expression "nomenclature binaire")*: This question is the subject of a special Report which has been circulated as Paper I.C.(48)5. (*Opinions 20 and 37*.)

23. *Article 25, Proviso (c) (meaning of expression "definite bibliographic reference")*: This provision, which was the subject of an interpretation in *Opinion 138*, is dealt with in a special proposal which has been submitted to the Commission in Paper I.C.(48)6, paragraphs 13 and 14.

24. *Article 26*: Words to be inserted to make it clear that, as laid down in *Opinion 3*, any work published in 1758 is to be treated as having been published subsequent to the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus and therefore subsequent to the starting point of zoological nomenclature.

25. *Article 27*: Words to be inserted to make it clear that, as laid down in *Opinion 88*, a specific name is not invalidated if in the original description of the species its author included descriptions of the bodily parts of more than

one species, and that the name of a genus having such a species as its type species is available under the *Règles*, the identity of that species to be determined in accordance with the provisions of *Article 31*.

26. *Article 30, Rule (a) (types of genera having emended names)*: Words to make it clear that, as laid down in *Opinion 148*, where a generic name is emended, the type species of the genus bearing the emended name is automatically the same species as the type of the genus bearing the name which has been replaced.

27. *Article 30, Rule (a) (type of a genus published with the formula "n.g., n.sp.")*: Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion 7*, that, where a genus was established prior to 1st January, 1931, and no type was otherwise designated, the expression "n.g., n.sp." is to be taken as designating as the type species the species so indicated. (The proviso (proviso (c)) which was added to *Article 25* by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Budapest in 1927 applied new and more rigorous conditions to names published after 31st December, 1930 (the date as from which that proviso came into force), but the older and less rigorous conditions remained applicable to names published before 1st January, 1931. The interpretation of *Article 25* given in *Opinion 7* would have been inconsistent with the express provisions of that *Article* if it had been rendered after the date on which the new proviso (c) had entered into force. It follows therefore that that interpretation applies only to names published prior to 1st January, 1931.)

28. *Article 30, Rule (c) (type of a genus not intended to be monotypical but for which only one species is definitely cited by name)*: Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion 47* (case of *Carcharias Rafinesque*), that, where a genus is established without a designated type and with only one cited species, that species is the type under *Rule (c)* of *Article 30*, irrespective of whether or not the author concerned intended the genus to be monotypical.

29. *Article 30, Rule (d) (question whether a tautonymous specific or subspecific trivial name need be cited in the original publication of a generic name in order to make Rule (d) applicable to that generic name)*: Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion 18* (case of *Hydrus Schneider*), that, where a genus is established without a designated type and one of the included species has a synonym, of which the specific or subspecific trivial name consists of the same word as the generic name, it is immaterial for the purposes of *Rule (d)* in *Article 30* whether that tautonymous trivial name is cited in the original description of the genus, in cases where the name of that genus was published prior to 1st January, 1931. (The limitation of this provision to names published before 1st January, 1931, is due to the same reason as that explained in the similar case discussed in paragraph 27 above.)

30. *Article 30, Rule (d) (type of a genus established without a designated type but containing a species for which a pre-1758 universal specific name consisting of the same word as the generic name is cited as a synonym of one of the included*



*species*): Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion 16* (case of *Equus* Linnaeus, etc.), that, where a genus is established without a designated type and where in the original description of one (but not more than one) of the included species there is a synonymy containing a name which prior to 1758 had been published as a univocal specific name and that name consists of the same word as the generic name, such citation is equivalent, for the purposes of Rule (d) in Article 30, to the citation of a tautonymous specific trivial name, in the case of a generic name published prior to 1st January, 1931. (The example cited in *Opinion 16* is that of the genus *Equus* Linnaeus, 1758, where in the original description of one of the included species (*E. caballus*) there was a synonymy containing the pre-1758 univocal specific name "*Equus*," as used by Gesner, which signified "The Horse," i.e., the species named *E. caballus* by Linnaeus.) (The limitation of this provision to names published before 1st January, 1931, is due to the same reason as that explained in paragraph 27 above.)

31. *Article 30, Rule (f) (species eligible for selection as the type of a genus established as a substitute genus, where either genus, when originally established, contained species which are recognisable but which were not on that occasion cited under binominal names)*: Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion 35*, that, where a generic name, published prior to 1st January, 1931, was published as a substitute for an earlier generic name and no type species was designated for either genus, the species cited in the original description of the genus, the name of which is being replaced, as well as the species cited in the original description of the substitute genus, are eligible for subsequent selection as the type of the substitute genus and it is immaterial whether the species in question was originally cited under a scientific name. (The limitation of this provision to names published before 1st January, 1931, is due to the reason explained in paragraph 27 above.)

32. *Article 30, Rule (g) (interpretation parallel to that given in Opinion 35 in relation to Rule (f))*: Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion 35*, that, where a genus was established prior to 1st January, 1931, without a designated type, any species originally included in the genus is eligible for subsequent selection as the type, irrespective of whether that species was originally cited under a binominal name or not. (The limitation of this provision to names published before 1st January, 1931, is due to the reason explained in paragraph 27 above.)

33. *Article 30, Rule (g) (types of genera established with identical limits)*: Words to be inserted to make it clear, in accordance with *Opinion 10*, that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, two genera with identical limits (i.e. with the same included species) were formed independently by different authors and neither genus had a designated type, any of the included species may be selected as the type of either or both genera. (The limitation of this provision to names published before 1st January, 1931, is due to the reason explained in paragraph 27 above.)

34. *Article 30, Rule (g) (the type of one genus not excluded from selection as the type of another genus):* Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion 62*, that a species may be selected as the type of a genus established prior to 1st January, 1931, notwithstanding the fact that that species is already the type of some other genus. (The limitation of this provision to names published before 1st January, 1931, is due to the reason explained in paragraph 27 above.)

35. *Article 30, Rule (g) (types of genera not affected on union of genera on taxonomic grounds):* Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion 164*, that, when two or more genera are united on taxonomic grounds, such action in no way affects the types of the genera concerned, the broader genus thus formed taking as its name the oldest available generic name based on any included species and the genus bearing that name retaining as its type the species previously so established.

36. *Article 30, Rule (g) (type of a genus containing only two species automatically fixed when one of the species becomes the type of a monotypical genus):* Words to be inserted to make clear, as laid down in *Opinion 6*, that, where a genus established prior to 1st January, 1931, contains only two included species and a subsequent author selects one of those species to be the type of a new monotypical genus, that action automatically constitutes the selection of the other species to be the type of the original genus. (The limitation of this provision to names published before 1st January, 1931, is due to the reason explained in paragraph 27 above.)

37. *Article 30, Rule (g) (validity of a type selection not affected if the author making the selection did so as the result of having misidentified the species so selected):* Words to be inserted to make it clear that a type selection is not invalidated where the author making the selection misidentified the species which he so selected. (*Opinion 14*.)

38. *Article 30 (identity of included species assumed to have been correctly determined by the original author of a genus):* Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion 65* and again in *Opinion 168*, that it is to be assumed that the author of a genus correctly identified the species referred by him thereto.

39. *Article 30 (species eligible for selection as the type of a genus published with a definition or description but with no species distinctly referred thereto):* Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion 46*, that, where prior to 1st January, 1931, a genus was established with a definition or description but with no species distinctly referred thereto, the genus is to be deemed to contain all the species in the world, the characters of which agree with the definition or description, and the first species to be cited as being referable to the genus automatically becomes its type. (The limitation of this provision to names published before 1st January, 1931, is due to the reason explained in paragraph 27 above.)

40. *Article 30 (selection of types of genera in abstracts, etc.):* Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion* 172, that where the type of a genus has been clearly selected in an Abstract, Record or similar publication, that selection must be accepted as satisfying the requirements of this Article.

41. *Article 34 (criteria to be observed in determining whether closely similar words are to be treated as identical with one another):* Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion* 147, that a generic name is to be rejected as a homonym of a previously published generic name if it is distinguished therefrom only by the following differences in spelling:—(a) the use of “ae,” “oe,” and “e”; the use of “ei,” “i,” and “y”; or the use of “c” and “k”; (b) the aspiration or non-aspiration of a consonant; (c) the presence or absence of a “c” before a “t”; (d) the use of a single or double consonant. It should be noted that in *Opinion* 147 the foregoing interpretation of Article 35 was limited to cases where the names in question were “of the same origin and meaning” but that for reasons explained in paragraph 40 of Paper I.C.(48)8 in relation to specific homonyms, it is proposed that this unworkable provision should now be discarded.

42. *Article 34 (status of a generic name which is identical with a generic name which is an emendation of an earlier generic name):* Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion* 148 (and in an individual case in *Opinion* 125) that a generic name is to be rejected as a homonym if it has previously been published as an emendation of another generic name of earlier date.

43. *Article 34 (a substitute generic name not to be rejected on the ground that it is of the same origin and meaning as the name which it replaces):* In *Opinion* 148 the Commission decided that a generic name published as a substitute name (*nomen novum*) for a name rejected by reason of its being a homonym is not itself to be rejected on the ground that it is of the same origin and meaning as the name for which it has been proposed as a substitute. As explained in paragraph 41 above, it is proposed to discard the expression “of the same origin and meaning” in the provision to be incorporated in the *Règles*. If this recommendation is accepted, the provision here under discussion will no longer have any relevance and need not be incorporated in the *Règles*, though otherwise such incorporation would be necessary.

44. *Article 34 (a generic name not invalidated by prior use for an ordinal or higher category):* Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion* 102 (relating to the relative status of *Protocephalus* (generic name) and *Protocephala* (an earlier suprageneric name)), that a generic name is not to be rejected on the ground that the same word has previously been published as the name for a suprageneric group.

45. *Articles 34 and 35 (status of generic and specific trivial names when those names have been previously published in works rejected for nomenclatorial purposes):* Words to be inserted to make it clear, as laid down in *Opinion* 145, that, where a work is rejected for nomenclatorial purposes, either under Article



25 or under the plenary powers conferred upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, names (whether generic names or specific trivial names) which first appeared in such works are to be treated as having never been published and in consequence that, where an author subsequently establishes a genus or species to which he applies the same name as one used in the rejected work, the later published name is available nomenclatorially and is not to be rejected as a homonym by reason of the earlier publication of that name in the work so rejected.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the Commission,  
London, England.

15th July, 1948.

# INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

PAPER  
I.C.(48)12

## MISCELLANEOUS PROPOSALS FOR THE AMENDMENT OR CLARIFICATION OF THE "RÈGLES" : FIRST INSTALMENT

### *Memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission*

In the course of correspondence and discussions with zoologists in many parts of the world, I have received numerous suggestions for the amendment of the *Règles* in various minor respects, for the addition of provisions relating to matters of different kinds on which the *Règles* are at present silent and for the clarification of various passages in the *Règles* where the meaning is at present obscure.

2. In preparing documents for the consideration of the Commission at its Paris meeting, I had to concentrate my attention in the first place on those matters of a constitutional and procedural kind on which immediate decisions are necessary in order to ensure that the Commission may become a genuinely representative body and one governed by a procedure which will enable it effectively to discharge the duties entrusted to it. Next I marshalled in a series of papers the considerations which appear to me to be relevant for the consideration of a number of major problems on which it is essential that decisions should be secured (e.g. the problem presented by the expression "nomenclature binaire") and outlined the proposals of the Executive Committee for the codification of the present state of international law in regard to zoological nomenclature through the incorporation in the *Règles* of provisions giving effect to the interpretative *Opinions* rendered at various times by the Commission. Unfortunately this has left me with insufficient time to prepare a full list of the miscellaneous suggestions which I have received for the improvement of the *Règles* in various directions. I have, however, made a start with this part of the Agenda of the Commission and submit in the present paper a list giving a first instalment of the suggestions received. It is my hope that time will permit me, after my arrival in Paris, to prepare a further paper or papers completing the list now submitted.

### First instalment of suggestions for the improvement of the "Règles" in various respects

#### A. *Proposals relating to existing Articles*

(1) *Article 8 (proposed insertion of a provision to secure brevity in generic names)*: Professor J. C. Faure (Pretoria) has submitted a proposal for the avoidance in future of unnecessarily long names in zoological nomenclature.



After discussion with him and other zoologists it is suggested that a *Recommandation* in the following sense should be attached to Article 8 of the *Règles*:

It is recommended that authors establishing new genera (or subgenera) or re-naming genera (or subgenera) the previously published names of which are invalid as homonyms should avoid unnecessarily long names and that the words selected should, wherever possible, consist of not more than 15 letters. (Z.N.(S)297.)

(2) *Article 13 (permissive use of a capital initial letter for certain classes of specific trivial names)*: Many zoologists have suggested to me that in view of the fact that, as compared with the time when the *Règles* were adopted, very few authors use a capital initial letter when citing any specific trivial name, the time has come when Article 13 should be re-drafted so as to prescribe the uniform use of a small initial letter for such names. I have great sympathy with this recommendation, which I commend to the favourable consideration of the International Commission. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(3) *Article 14 (proposed insertion of a provision to secure brevity in specific trivial names)*: In accordance with Professor Faure's proposal referred to under No. (1) above, it is suggested that a *Recommandation* in the following sense should be attached to Article 14 of the *Règles*:—

It is recommended that authors describing new species (or subspecies) or re-naming species (or subspecies) the previously published names of which are invalid as homonyms should avoid unnecessarily long names and that the words selected should, wherever possible, consist of not more than 15 letters. (Z.N.(S)297.)

(4) *Article 24, Example*: A new example should be substituted for "*Taenia solium* Linné, *partim*, Goeze," for it is clearly most misleading to give an example which includes a reference to a non-binominal author. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(5) *Article 22, "Recommandation."* This *Recommandation* advises zoologists who wish to abbreviate the names of authors to follow the system used in a list published in Berlin in 1896. As the list referred to is out of print and virtually unobtainable, the utility of this *Recommandation* has disappeared and I suggest therefore that it should be deleted. With the enormous growth of the number of authors of zoological books and papers since the adoption of the above *Recommandation* nearly 50 years ago, the objection to abbreviating the names of authors has greatly increased, for this practice often leads to unnecessary confusion and waste of time in tracing bibliographical references, since, obviously, it is an enormous handicap if, as the result of the use of an abbreviation, it is not even possible to recognise the name of the author of the paper to be consulted. I should like therefore to suggest that the Commission should consider recommending the insertion, in place of the existing provision, of a new *Recommandation* urging authors, when citing previously published papers, to refrain from abbreviating the names of any of the authors cited, except in the case of deceased authors whose names by reason of the importance of their published work will be easily recognised, even if abbreviated. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(6) *Article 25 (proposed insertion of a provision to secure that apparent new names (generic or trivial) or apparent new combinations due to errors in recording journals should have no status in nomenclature):* Dr. C. W. Sabrosky (Washington, D.C.) has raised the question of the status of an apparent new name (generic or trivial) or of an apparent new combination appearing in a recording or abstracting publication in cases where reference to the original publications shows the apparent new name or new combination to be clearly due to an error in recording. It is suggested that words should be added to Article 25 to ensure that an apparent new name or new combination, when clearly due to an error in recording, should have no status in nomenclature and should not therefore be held to pre-occupy the same name or combination published deliberately at some later date for the same or another genus or species. (Z.N.(S)334).

(7) *Article 25, proviso (b).* The expression "principes de la nomenclature binaire" which, in Paper I.C.(48)5, it is now proposed, should be replaced by the expression "principes de la nomenclature binominale" has been the subject of a good deal of misunderstanding, quite apart from the ambiguity created by the use of the word "binaire". It is proposed that, in order to remedy this, words should be inserted to make it clear that the words (which in the English translation read) "has applied the principles . . ." mean "has applied those principles throughout the work in question and not merely in a particular section or passage in that work." (Z.N.(S)352.)

(8) *Article 30 (restriction of certain portions to names published before a certain date):* In view of the addition at Budapest in 1927 of proviso (c) to Article 25, Sections II and III of Article 30 are inapplicable to generic names published after 31st December, 1930, while it is not clear if all the Rules included in Section I of that Article apply to such names. In order to remove doubts on this question, it is recommended that words should be inserted to make it clear that, subject to the exceptions noted in paragraphs 27, 29 to 34, 36 and 39 in Paper I.C.(48)11, Rules (a), (b), (c) and (d) in Article 30 apply to all generic names, irrespective of the date of their publication, but that the remainder of this Article is applicable only to names published before 1st January, 1931. For the reason why it is proposed that, subject to the exceptions cited, Rules (a) to (d) should apply to all generic names, see paragraphs 12 to 15 of Paper I.C.(48)6. The problem raised in this proposal was placed before the Commission by specialists in the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(9) *Article 30 (need for drafting amendments to make clear that the provisions in this Article are concerned with nomenclature and not with taxonomy).* The Commission have always rightly insisted on the need for distinguishing between nomenclature and taxonomy and for confining the *Règles* to the former. There are however cases in the *Règles* where the two ideas are confused with one another through inexpert drafting. Article 30 is full of illogicalities of this kind. In order to make this Article readily intelligible, its wording should be modified to make it clear that its purpose is to provide Rules by which, for any given nominal genus (i.e. any genus for which a separate name has been published), one of the originally included nominal species (i.e. one of the species

cited by name by the original author of the genus as a species included by him in that genus) shall be designated as the type. It is strongly recommended that this change should be introduced. Similarly the opportunity should be taken to remove the inconsistency arising from the misconceived use of the expression "genus" (as in Rules (a) to (d) and (e)) when what is intended is "generic name" (the expression correctly used in Rule (g)). What is important is to make it clear that each Rule applies to the name of a given nominal genus. It will then be possible to eliminate such absurd expressions as "publication of a genus", "In case of a generic name without originally designated type", etc. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(10) *Article 30 (formal amendment needed to correct inept drafting):* This Article at present consists of a single sentence which purports to enumerate certain "Rules" governing the designation of the types of genera. In all there are 20 of these "Rules". On inspection however we find that only the first seven of these "Rules" (Rules (a) to (g)) are in fact mandatory provisions, while the remaining thirteen "Rules" are not rules at all but, as expressly stated in the title of the cross-heading "III." are "*Recommandations*". It is proposed that this anomaly due to inept drafting should be eliminated by a re-wording which will restrict the word "Rule" to the provisions (a) to (g) which are in fact rules and will provide for the remaining provisions which are not rules but recommendations a separate serial numbering as "*Recommandations*." (Z.N.(S)352.)

(11) *Article 30 Rule (g) (case where a type is selected for a genus by an author without that author being conscious of so doing).* The attention of the Commission has been drawn by numerous zoologists to the following ambiguity in Rule (g) of Article 30:

Does the expression "select the type" cover a case where an author expressly states that the originally included nominal species *A-us b-us* is the type of the nominal genus *X-us* but at the same time adds words which either make it clear or imply that the author making the statement believed (erroneously) that the above species had already been selected as the type by some previous author or, in the case of papers published before the adoption of the present *Règles*, where the author believed the above species was automatically the type through the operation of the so-called (but non-existent) "Law of Elimination" and accepted it as such?

It appears to me that in conformity with the principle that the *Règles* are concerned only with objective facts (as contrasted with subjective taxonomic ideas) it is not practicable (or desirable) to take into account the ideas which were in the mind of a given author when he stated that a particular species was the type of a particular genus. Any other course would moreover invalidate thousands of type selections now accepted as having been made prior to 1901 by authors who accepted the so-called "Law of Elimination" (not recognised in the present *Règles* as a mandatory provision) and who, in stating that such and such a species was the type of a given genus thought that they were doing no more than stating a fact. It is strongly recommended that the question posed at the beginning of this paragraph should be answered in the affirmative and that words to this effect should be incorporated in the *Règles*. (Z.N.(S)352.)



(12) *Article 31 (first sentence).* This is a badly worded provision and it is desirable that it should be replaced by words which would make it clear that, where a nominal species, as originally established, is found to be a composite species and it is necessary therefore to subdivide it, the subdivision shall be effected in accordance with the provisions relating to the subdivision of a genus specified in Article 29 and Rule (g) in Article 30 and that the original specific name shall therefore adhere to whichever element in the original composite species is so designated as its type. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(13) *Article 35 (status of a specific trivial name which is identical with a name which is an emendation of an older name in the same genus):* In *Opinion 148* the Commission gave a ruling on a case parallel to that indicated above in regard to a generic name and it has been proposed (paragraph 42 of Paper I.C.(48)11) that this decision should now be incorporated in the *Règles*. Clearly any such provision in regard to generic names should apply also to specific and subspecific trivial names, and it is proposed therefore that a corresponding provision should be inserted in Article 35. (Z.N.(S)352.)

#### B. Proposed new Articles

(14) *Terminology, etc., of types of species and subspecies:* There is evidently a widespread desire on the part of many zoologists that the terminology of types of species and subspecies should be dealt with in the *Règles* in greater detail than at present. As the Commission will recall, the only existing provision in regard to this subject is that contained in the sentence inserted between Sections "A" and "B" of the *Appendice* by the Monaco Congress in 1913. It is suggested that this provision should be deleted and that a new provision should be inserted on the following lines:—

- (1) A *Recommendation* should be added to Article 25 strongly urging every author publishing a new specific or subspecific name clearly to designate one specimen to be the type of the new species or subspecies, to indicate the full locality and other data on the label of that specimen, the sex of the specimen so selected, and the collection in which the type is deposited; and, in the case of fossil species, the geological age of the species, measured, if possible, by the number of metres stratigraphically above or below a well-established plane.
- (2) A *Recommendation* urging every zoologist naming a new species or subspecies clearly to mark as the "type" the specimen so selected and either to deposit it in a Museum or otherwise to ensure both that it is safely preserved and that it is accessible to students./
- (3) A provision to be inserted at some appropriate point either in the *Règles* themselves or in the *Appendice* recognising the existence of the following categories of types for species and subspecies:—

*Holotype* the single specimen taken as "the type" by the original author.

*Syntype* one of a number of specimens of equal rank which formed part of the material before an author when describing a species or subspecies for which he did not designate a holotype.

*Lectotype* the single specimen selected from a series of syntypes to be "the type." (In order to be effective, the selection of a lectotype must be made known by being announced in a publication.)

*Paratype* a specimen other than the holotype which formed part of the original material before an author when describing a new species or subspecies. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(15) *The trivial name of a nominotypical subspecies*: The *Règles* contain a provision (Article 9) regarding the name of the typical subgenus of a genus having two or more subgenera. There is however no corresponding provision regarding the name of the nominotypical subspecies of a species having two or more subspecies, though the intention of the authors of the *Règles* to insert such a provision is implied by the second of the examples cited in Article 33. No evidence is available to explain why effect was not given to that intention, and it is proposed to remedy this defect by the insertion of an Article laying it down that the trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies of a species having two or more subspecies shall be the same as the trivial name of the species itself. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(16) *Proposed recognition of "neotypes"*: There is clearly a widespread desire especially among palaeozoologists for the recognition under certain conditions of "neotypes." There is great divergence of view, however, as to what those conditions should be. There are also numerous zoologists who are opposed to the recognition of neotypes on the ground that this would lead to abuses (commercial and other) and would result in greater confusion than uniformity. I have been unable so far to devise, for submission to the Commission, any proposal which would be likely to be generally acceptable to zoologists. Although I am very conscious of the possible dangers inherent in the recognition of neotypes, I recognise the importance attached to this question by many workers, and I consider that the proposal is one to which sympathetic consideration should be given by the Commission. I accordingly suggest that the Commission should follow in this case a procedure similar to that which (as explained in paragraph 2 of Paper I.C.(48)9) they adopted at Lisbon in connection with the problem of the names of infra-subspecific forms, that is to say that they should instruct the Secretary to the Commission to confer with interested specialists, with a view to the submission to the Commission at the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress of a Report discussing fully the issues involved and, if possible, formulating proposals for the insertion in the *Règles* of comprehensive provisions relating to this matter. (Z.N.(S)24.)

(17) *Proposed addition of an Article to prevent the misuse of the "Règles" for the purpose of giving political, religious or personal offence*. A memorial was recently submitted to the Commission by a large number of Brazilian zoologists regarding a new generic name published by a certain Brazilian zoologist with the intention, so the memorialists state, of being offensive to another zoologist with whom he had been in dispute in the law courts, the new name consisting of the name of his adversary combined with a vulgar Portuguese term of abuse. The zoologists submitting the case asked for some means of

preventing the *Règles* being misused in this way. It is clearly highly objectionable that persons should be free to pursue personal quarrels through the protection afforded by the Law of Priority. At present there exists no means of invalidating a name so given, and it seems to me highly desirable that the Commission should be given power to act in such cases. I consider, moreover, that if provision of this sort is to be made in the *Règles*, the wording should be sufficiently wide to provide a ready means for the suppression not only of names likely to give personal offence (as is alleged in the case referred to here) but also of names consisting of words or combinations of words calculated to wound religious or political susceptibilities. I suggest that the best course would be to secure the insertion of a new Article in the *Règles* with provisions along the following lines:—

- (1) The use for a generic or subgeneric name or for the trivial name of a species or subspecies or for a form of less than subspecific rank of a word (whether simple or compound) which can reasonably be regarded, in any language, as calculated to cause political, religious or personal offence is prohibited.
- (2) No name published in contravention of the provisions of the preceding sub-section is to possess any rights under the Law of Priority, as defined in Article 25 of the *Règles*.
- (3) It shall be open to any person who is of the opinion that a given name has been published in contravention of the provisions of the present Article to refer the question to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, and it shall be the duty of the said Commission promptly to consider every such case submitted to it and, if satisfied that the submission is well grounded, to order the name concerned to be suppressed for all purposes, under the immediately preceding paragraph. (Z.N.(S)348.)

### C. *Proposals relating to drafting changes*

(18) *Citation, in the "Règles," of nouns in the singular.* It is a recognised principle of drafting that clarity is assisted if in mandatory provisions every noun is cited in the singular number and that the reverse is the case if the plural number is employed. In many parts of the *Règles* this principle has been followed but in others it has been neglected. It is suggested that the *Règles* should be made consistent in this respect. Examples of awkward drafting resulting from the failure to observe this principle are provided (1) by the opening words of Article 20 ("In forming names derived from languages . . .") which would read much better if the words used were "In forming" (or better "In the formation of") "a name derived from a language . . ." and (2) by the opening sentence of Article 30 which would be greatly improved if the opening phrase were to read "The designation of the type species of a nominal genus . . ." instead of "The designation of the type species of genera . . .". (Z.N.(S)352.)

(19) *Need for removal of verbal inconsistencies of drafting.* The use in a code of law of more than one expression to denote the same concept is well known as likely to cause subsequent confusion and argument. It is suggested that all such blemishes should be removed from the *Règles*. A flagrant example of this kind of defect is to be found in Article 30, where the same concept is denoted by no less than three different expressions, namely, "type species," "generic type" and "type." Another example of this kind of defect is the use in Article 30 in Rules (a) and (b) of the expression "publication" and in Rule (c) of the expression "proposed" to denote exactly the same idea. (Z.N.(S)352.)



(20) *Need for deleting from the "Règles" meaningless repetitive phrases.* The *Règles* contain a number of repetitive phrases, a feature which is a weakness in any code of law, for persons using the code naturally suppose that the words have been inserted for some purpose and try to read differences of meaning into the phrases concerned. Among blemishes of this kind which should be deleted are :—

- (1) Article 25 proviso (c) (1) and (2): the unnecessary and undefined expressions "*seu* diagnosis; *seu* definition; *seu* condensed description."
- (2) Article 25 (c) (3): the unnecessary and undefined expression "*seu* genotype; *seu* autogenotype; *seu* orthotype." (Z.N.(S)352.)

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the Commission,  
London, England.

16th July, 1948.

## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

## PAPER

I.C.(48)13

## PROPOSED INCORPORATION IN THE "RÈGLES" OF DECISIONS TAKEN AT VARIOUS TIMES EITHER BY THE CONGRESS OR BY THE COMMISSION AND SUBSEQUENTLY EMBODIED IN "DECLARATIONS" RENDERED BY THE COMMISSION

---

Memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission

In the Agenda for the International Commission at its Paris meeting, which has been circulated as Paper I.C.(48)1, there was included a proposal (paragraph 2(5)) that the Commission should seek the approval of the Congress for the incorporation in the *Règles* of interpretations of the provisions of that instrument given by the Commission in *Opinions* rendered at various times, together with certain resolutions of a more general character which had formed the subject of resolutions adopted at various times by the Congress or the Commission and which have since been formally embodied by the Commission in *Declarations*. The proposals to be submitted to the Commission as regards interpretations of the *Règles* given in *Opinions* have been set out in Paper I.C.(48)11. The present paper contains corresponding recommendations as regards the resolutions recorded in *Declarations* rendered by the Commission.

2. For the present purposes the 12 *Declarations* rendered by the Commission fall into three groups :—

- (1) *Declarations* dealing with matters which fall outside the scope of the *Règles*;
- (2) *Declarations* dealing with matters which have been the subject of recommendations separately submitted to the Commission at its present meeting; and
- (3) *Declarations* dealing with matters of direct concern to the *Règles* and which have not been put before the Commission in other papers circulated for consideration at the Paris meeting.

3. Class (1) includes two *Declarations*, namely *Declaration* 9 (" On the desirability of universities including zoological nomenclature in their courses of general and systematic zoology ") and *Declaration* 10 (" On the importance of forming specialist groups for the study of the nomenclature of particular divisions of the Animal Kingdom ").

4. Class (2) contains one *Declaration* (Declaration 5), which gives the text of the Resolution adopted by the Congress in 1913, which conferred plenary powers upon the International Commission in certain cases to suspend the *Règles*. Proposals for the incorporation in the *Règles* of this Resolution in a slightly amended form have been submitted to the Commission in Paper I.C.(48)4.

5. Of the nine remaining *Declarations* with which we are here concerned three relate to the conduct of zoologists in relation to nomenclatorial questions and six to particular points relating mainly to bibliographical aspects of nomenclature. These two classes are considered separately below.

(a) "*Declarations*" relating to conduct.

6. *Code of Ethics*: This is dealt with in *Declarations* 1 and 12. It is proposed that at an appropriate place in the *Règles* there should be inserted an Article which should lay it down (*Declaration* 1) that, when a zoologist notices that a generic or specific name published by a living author as a new name is invalid by reason of being a homonym, his correct course is to notify the author concerned accordingly and to give that author ample opportunity of proposing a substitute name before proposing one himself. To this provision there should be added the further provision (*Declaration* 12) that it is no part of the duties of the International Commission to consider and pass judgment upon alleged contraventions of the foregoing provision, the observance of which must be left to the proper feelings of individual zoologists.

7. *Use of intemperate language in the discussion of nomenclature*: This subject is dealt with in the Commission's *Declaration* 4, which is of great value not only as an exhortation to propriety of conduct but also as an aid to editors who can point to it as the justification for the deletion of unduly controversial matter in papers submitted for publication. An Article embodying the substance of this *Declaration*, that is to say an Article laying it down that the use of intemperate language is to be avoided in discussions of zoological nomenclature, could appropriately be inserted in the *Règles* next to the Article embodying the Code of Ethics which also is concerned with a question of conduct. It is recommended that this should be done.

(b) "*Declarations*" relating to nomenclatorial practice.

8. *Issue of separates in advance of the publication of a paper in a scientific journal*: The Commission have already laid it down in *Opinion* 59 that a name ranks not from the date of distribution of advance separates but from that on which the paper is actually published in a scientific journal (see paragraph 17 of Paper I.C.(48)11). It is proposed that there should be inserted in Article 25 of the *Règles* a *Recommandation* embodying the resolution set out in *Declaration* 2, that is to say a *Recommandation* urging editors not to make available, and authors not to distribute, copies of papers prior to their being actually published in the scientific journal for inclusion in which they have been printed.



9. *Need for indicating new names as such and for avoiding the publication of names as new on more than one occasion*: It is proposed that *Recommendations* dealing with these important matters, both of which are dealt with in *Declaration 6*, should be inserted in Article 25. The first of these *Recommendations* would strongly recommend authors, when publishing new names, clearly to indicate that they are so doing, the second urging authors not to publish the same name as a new name in more than one paper and not to publish the same paper in more than one journal without indicating that it has already been published and giving a reference to the journal in which it has been so published.

10. *Need for indicating the date of publication of zoological works*: This subject is dealt with in *Declarations 3* and *8*. It is proposed that a *Recommendation* be added to Article 25 urging (1) that the exact date of publication (year, month and day) be clearly stated in every zoological work and (2) that, in the case of journals and separate works issued in parts, each part should bear the exact date of publication and that on the completion of the volume concerned there should be added a statement giving the date of publication of each part and indicating its exact contents (both pages and plates).

11. *Need for citing bibliographical references*: In order to bring to the attention of zoologists the resolution embodied in *Declaration 7*, it is recommended that a *Recommendation* be inserted in some appropriate Article of the *Règles* urging authors who cite generic, specific or subspecific names in papers containing original observations to insert at least once in the paper the name of the author and the date of publication of each name cited or to give a full bibliographical reference to that name.

12. *Need for indicating in new descriptions the systematic position in the Animal Kingdom of the organism described*: It is proposed that a *Recommendation* be added to Article 25 to give effect to the resolution embodied in *Declaration 11*. This *Recommendation* would urge authors when publishing new descriptions clearly to indicate the systematic position in the Animal Kingdom of the category or species described, and, in the case of new genera and species, to indicate the Class and Order to which the organism belongs and, if the Order is commonly divided into families, the name of the family to which the genus or species belongs.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the Commission,  
London, England.

15th July, 1948.

## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

## PAPER

## I.C.(48)14

MISCELLANEOUS PROPOSALS FOR THE AMENDMENT OR CLARIFICATION  
OF THE "RÈGLES": SECOND INSTALMENT*Memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission*

In Paper I.C.(48)12 I circulated a first instalment of 20 miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. In the present paper I submit a second instalment of proposals of this kind. For convenience of reference, these are numbered consecutively with those enumerated in Paper I.C.(48)12.

**Second instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the improvement of the "Règles" in various respects**

(21) *Article 8 (need for a provision to cover cases of generic names which, though complying with Section (k) of the second "Recommandation," are in fact Latin or Latinised words in some case or number other than the nominative singular):* Paragraph 4 of Paper I.C.(48)11 contains a recommendation that the interpretation of Article 8 (need for generic names to be published in the nominative singular before they can acquire rights under the Law of Priority) given in *Opinion* 183 should now be incorporated in the *Règles*. Commissioner H. Boschma (Z.N.(S)223) has pointed out that some additional provision is required to meet the case of generic names which were published as though they were nouns in the nominative singular and were so used by their original authors but which are in fact Latinised Greek words in some case or number other than the nominative singular. Examples cited by Stebbing are—*Kepon* Duvernoy, 1840, a Latinised translation into Greek (as *κηπων*) of the name of the French zoologist Desjardins and therefore a word in the genitive plural); *Potamon* Savigny, 1816 (the genitive plural of the Greek noun "*ποταμός*" (a river); and *Taloipa* Buckton, 1905 (a composite word consisting of the Greek words "*τὰ*" and "*λοιπα*" (the two words, when read together, meaning "the remainder") which must therefore be regarded as a noun of neuter gender in the nominative plural.

In order to cover the case of a name of the type discussed above, it is proposed that a "Proviso" should be added to Article 8 making it clear that a generic name which was treated by its original author as a Latinised noun in the nominative singular is not invalid solely by reason of the fact that it consists of a Latinised version of a word or a combination of words in any language which, in the original, consisted of a word, or words, in some case other than the nominative or some number other than the singular, or in both case and number other than the nominative singular.

(22) *Article 14 (proposed addition of a "Recommendation")*: Professor Pierre Bonnet has suggested (Z.N.(S)352) that a *Recommendation* should be added to Article 11 urging authors not to select as the trivial name of a new species or subspecies a word which has already been used (1) in the same Family or (2) in the same Order or (3) even in the same geographical region. Everyone will agree in principle that the use of trivial names such as *vulgaris*, *domesticus*, *silvestris*, *niger*, *griseus*, etc., in allied groups is confusing and therefore open to objection and that the insertion of a *Recommendation* on this subject in Article 14 is therefore desirable. On the other hand, it would, in my opinion, be going too far to include the conditions numbered (1) and (2), for a Family may be, and an Order certainly would be, too wide to be appropriately embraced in such a *Recommendation*. I consider that Professor Bonnet's proposal (3) is unnecessary and serves no useful purpose, for no confusion could arise if (say) a passerine bird and a heron or a Tineid moth and a Papilionid butterfly occurring in the same zoo-geographical region had the same trivial name. I suggest that a *Recommendation* should be added to Article 14 but that it should be in general terms and should be to the effect that authors when selecting trivial names for new species or subspecies should refrain from selecting names already published for species or for subspecies of species in allied genera occurring in any part of the world.

(23) *Article 15 (suggested deletion of the alternative regarding the use of hyphens in specific trivial names consisting of compound words)*: Professor Pierre Bonnet has suggested (Z.N.(S)352) that this Article should be amended so as to eliminate the present choice of alternatives and therefore to require that a compound specific or subspecific trivial name should be written as a single word without the use of hyphens. The course suggested by Professor Bonnet is logical, and I feel that the Commission would be wise to agree to it.

(24) *Article 18 (nomenclature of hybrids)*: One of the longest outstanding cases is a proposal submitted to the Commission before the Lisbon Congress of 1935 by Dr. Hans Bytinski-Salz in regard to this Article. This proposal consists of four small points, of which the first and third are concerned with slight additions which it is suggested should be made to this Article to cover points not at present dealt with therein, while the second and fourth are concerned only to secure a more logical form of words than that which at present figures in the *Règles*. All four proposals are desirable and are recommended for approval. They are as follows:—

- (1) *Section (a) at end add*: "In the case of hybrids between species belonging to the same genus, the trivial names of the two parents united by the sign of multiplication may be placed in brackets and cited immediately after the name of the common genus. Example: *Tetrao (tetrix × urogallus)*".
- (2) *Section (b) at end*: Substitute the words "who first published and described the hybrid as such" for the words "who first recognised the hybrid form as such" (a reconnu comme telle la forme hybride).



- (3) *Section (c) after the example at present cited* : Add the words

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \textit{Tetrao tetrax} & \\ \text{or } \frac{}{} & \times & \textit{Gallus gallus} \\ & \textit{Tetrao urogallus} & \end{array}$$

- (4) *Section (d) at the beginning* : Substitute "When either of the parents of a hybrid is not unquestionably established both as to species and sex" for "When the parents of a hybrid are not known as such" (Quand les procréateurs d'un hybride ne sont pas reconnus comme tels). (Z.N.(S)21.)

(25) *Article 25 (status of names published anonymously or over initials only)* : The question has been raised (Z.N.(S)84) whether a name published anonymously or over initials only has rights under the Law of Priority (Article 25). No one will dispute that this method of publication is highly undesirable and I feel that there would be general agreement that as from some early future date names published in this way should be ruled to be unavailable until such later time as they appear in a book or paper published by an author whose name is given. On the other hand, there is clearly nothing in the *Règles* which at present invalidates a name published anonymously and a considerable number of names published in this way are in current use (for example the specific trivial names in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) published in the celebrated "Vienna Catalogue" of 1775). I therefore suggest that the Commission should now invite the Congress to agree to amend Article 25 in such a way as to make it clear :—

- (a) that any name published either anonymously or over initials only prior to (say) midnight G.M.T. 31st December 1950 (the point of time suggested in paragraph 23 of Paper I.C.(48)9 in connection with the proposal there submitted in regard to the status of names of less than specific rank) which satisfies the provisions specified in Article 25 has availability under this Article, but
- (b) that no name published anonymously or over initials only published after the point of time specified in (a) above is to have any availability until such later time as it is republished by the same or some other author in a book or paper in which that author's name is given ;
- (c) that the fact of re-publication by a named author shall be sufficient to validate such a name, provided either that in the publication concerned that author complies with the requirements of proviso (c) to Article 25 or, in cases where that proviso was complied with in the original (anonymous) publication of the name, that the later author gives a bibliographical reference to that publication ;
- (d) that, when a name is validated as in (c) above, it shall rank for purposes of priority as from the date of such validation and shall be attributed to the author by whom it was so validated.

(26) Article 25 (meaning of the expression "divulgué dans une publication") : As explained in paragraph 13 of paper I.C.(48)11, the Commission have twice given partial rulings regarding the meaning to be attached to the expression "divulgué dans une publication" but those rulings are not altogether suitable for inclusion in the *Règles* without further amplification. The rulings in question were not given as express decisions of the Commission and incorporated as such in the "Summary" of the *Opinions* concerned but were stated less formally in the explanatory text of those *Opinions*. The two *Opinions* in question were (1) *Opinion* 15 (which is concerned with the availability of the name *Craspedacusta sowerbii* Lankester, 1880) and *Opinion* 51 (which is concerned with the status of names published in 1797 in the *Museum Calonnianum*). In *Opinion* 15 the statement appears that "Publication in the sense of the Code consists in the public issue of printed matter". The statement in *Opinion* 51, which refers to, and qualifies, the definition given in *Opinion* 15, reads as follows :—

"The qualifying word 'public' in this definition indicates that the printed matter in question is not intended for special persons only or for a limited time, but that it is given to the world, or used in the nature of a permanent record."

Thirty-six years have gone by since even the more recent of the foregoing *Opinions* was rendered by the Commission and one development has occurred during that period which was not anticipated by the Commission, namely the publication of new names in books or papers reproduced by some process (e.g. photographic or lithographic processes of various kinds and mimeographing and similar methods) other than actual printing. All of these methods fall outside the scope of the Commission's ruling, for they are excluded by the use of the expression "printed matter". Many names published in works reproduced by one or other of the foregoing or similar methods have however been accepted by zoologists as from their appearance therein, and rightly so, for many papers reproduced by these methods are fully as well reproduced as papers produced by some actual method of "printing." Before the substance of the principles enunciated by the Commission in the *Opinions* referred to above can be incorporated in the *Règles*, it is essential that consideration should be given to this aspect of the question.

If we grant (as we should) that actual "printing" is not an essential condition, we must consider what were the objects of the Commission when they originally insisted that, in order that a given book or paper should be accepted as having been "divulgué dans une publication", that publication must consist of "printed matter." This subject was extensively discussed by the Commission during the inter-war years and it is possible to deduce certain important conclusions from the evidence so afforded (Z.N.(S)84). It is accordingly suggested that the International Congress of Zoology should be invited to amend Article 25 so as to provide a minimum standard to be complied with by all publications irrespective of their date of issue and a more rigorous standard to apply to names published after some near future date. It is further proposed that a *Recommendation* should be added to Article 25 laying down for guidance the ideal standard to be aimed at.

The following proposals are accordingly submitted for the favourable consideration of the International Commission :

- (1) that a name made public prior to midnight G.M.T. 31st December 1950 is to be deemed to have been "divulgué dans une publication" only if it complies with both of the following conditions :—
  - (a) it must be included in a document reproduced either by printing or by some other mechanical method of reproduction which secures that every copy is identical with every other copy ;
  - (b) the document in which the name is included must be a document issued for purposes of record and therefore of consultation by interested persons and must accordingly not be a document issued for exclusive consideration by special persons or for particular purposes or for only a limited time ;
- (2) that, in order to be deemed to have been "divulgué dans une publication", any name made public after the point of time specified in (1) above must comply with all the following conditions :—
  - (a) it must have been made public in conditions which satisfy the requirements of (a) and (b) in (1) above ;
  - (b) the document containing the new name must be reproduced on paper, and with ink of quality and durability sufficient to offer a reasonable prospect of permanency ;
  - (c) where a document is distributed by (or on behalf of) its author to certain selected persons, at least some copies must also be placed on sale or made available for issue free of charge to any institution or person who may apply for a copy ;
- (3) that a *Recommandation* be added to the relevant portion of Article 25 urging institutions and individuals responsible for the publication of works and papers containing new names to secure that there appears in the work or the part of the work or journal comprising papers containing such names a clear statement :
  - (a) of the name of the institution or individual responsible for publishing the work or journal concerned ;
  - (b) of the address from which the work or journal may be purchased
  - (c) of the price for which a copy may be obtained ;
- (4) that the mandatory provisions to be added to the *Règles* to give effect to the recommendations submitted in (1) and (2) above should specify also that none of the undermentioned types of action constitute publication :—
  - (a) the anonymous issue, or the issue over initials only, of a work or paper after 31st December 1950 (see Point No. (25) of the present paper) ;
  - (b) the deposit of a document, however reproduced, in a public library or in the library of a scientific institution ;
  - (c) the distribution of printers' proof sheets (See Point No. (15) in Paper I.C.(48)11;



- (d) the presentation of a paper before a meeting of any kind ;
  - (e) the distribution of *separata* (pre-prints, off-prints, etc.) in advance of the appearance of the paper in question in the journal, for inclusion in which it was printed (see Point No. (17) in Paper I.C.(48)11).
  - (f) the affixing of labels or tags on museum specimens ;
- (5) that the recommendation regarding the languages in which alone new systematic units should be proposed should be removed from its present position in Section "A" of the *Appendice* and, for greater prominence, inserted as a *Recommendation* to Article 25.

(27) *Article 25 (proposed addition of a "Recommendation" regarding names first published in abstracts)*: Dr. Waldo L. Schmitt (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.) has raised the question (Z.N.(S)262) of the status of names first published in an abstract of a paper issued in advance of the paper itself. This is a practice which was formerly followed by the Zoological Society of London and other Societies but which was subsequently abandoned because it was found to give rise to the publication of *nomina nuda* or of names with an "indication" of doubtful adequacy. It gave rise also to awkward questions such as that whether the "Abstract" containing the name had or had not been published, i.e. whether the name had been "divulgué dans une publication" in the sense of Article 25. Clearly whether a name so published is available under Article 25 depends upon the fullness of the description or indication given in the "Abstract." It is clear also however that this method of publishing a new name is calculated to lead to doubt and discussion as to the availability of the name in question and is therefore a method of publication which should be avoided. Similar criticisms apply to names first published in abstracts which appear at the head of a paper and which thus precede the main description of the new genus or species concerned. It is therefore recommended that a *Recommendation* be added to Article 25 urging all institutions and individuals responsible for the publication of papers containing new names to refrain from actually citing such names either (1) in abstracts published in advance of the actual publication of the papers themselves or (2) in abstracts placed at the head of the papers in which such names are to be published.

(28) *Article 25. (proposed addition of a "Recommendation" relating to generic and trivial names first published in keys)*: Dr. Waldo L. Schmitt (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.) has asked (Z.N.(S)262) for a ruling on the availability of names (generic or trivial) published in keys. We all know of numerous cases of this kind in which it would clearly be illogical and wrong to rule such names invalid solely by reason of their having been first published in keys. On the other hand, it is difficult in a key to comply with the requirements of Article 25 and, in the case of specific names, it would be virtually impossible in a key to comply with the terms of the *Recommendation* which it has been proposed, in paragraph (1) of Point (14) in Paper I.C.(48)12, should be added to that Article. It is accordingly suggested that a further

*Recommendation* should be added to Article 25 urging authors not to publish names for the first time in keys or, if it is desired to publish such names in a work or paper which contains, or consists primarily of, a key, to publish them at the beginning of the work or paper and before the key concerned.

(29) *Article 25 (date of publication)*: At the same time as the Commission considered the criteria to be adopted in determining whether a given book or paper had been "divulgué dans une publication" they considered also the question of the means by which the date of publication should be determined (Z.N.(8)84). The conclusions then provisionally reached, which are now submitted for final approval, were that a new provision should be inserted in or near Article 25 which would lay down the following rules:—

- (1) The date borne by a publication is to be assumed to be correct unless and until it is shown in a published statement to be otherwise.
- (2) A book or a journal or a part of a book or a journal which bears the month and year in which it was published is to be assumed to have been published on the last day of that month and a book or journal or part thereof which bears the year of publication but not the month shall be deemed to have been published on the last day of the last month of that year, except in so far as evidence can be brought forward from other sources to show that it, or a portion of it, was published on an earlier date in the same year, in which case the portion concerned is to be treated as having been published on the latest date compatible with the evidence so brought forward, the subsequent parts being treated as having been published on the last day of the last month of the year in question.
- (3) Where the only evidence as to the date of publication available in a given volume is a range of dates specified on the title page or otherwise, the whole volume is to be treated as though it were published on the last day of the latest month comprised in the latest of the years specified, and, if evidence that some specified portion was, or specified portions were, published at a given earlier date or dates, the dates of publication of the several portions of the volume shall be determined in the manner specified in (2) above, save that the date of publication of the last portion of the said volume shall be assumed to have taken place on the last day of the last month of the period.
- (4) Where a volume contains no direct evidence regarding the date on which it, or on which parts of it, were published, the date of publication of the volume or of its several parts shall be determined by reference to the dates of publication of the first-published volume or part of a volume of any other work or journal containing a reference thereto.

It is further suggested that there should be added a *Recommendation* urging authors:—

- (1) to refrain from placing brackets round the date of a name, if that date is given on the title page of the volume containing the name or in an express statement regarding the date of publication of the volume or its parts where that statement is included in the volume itself;

- (2) to enclose in round brackets a date or a part of a date where that date or that part of a date cannot be ascertained in the manner indicated in (1) but can be determined by reference to other evidence afforded by the volume itself, e.g. to evidence provided either by dates printed on the first pages of individual signatures or on the wrappers in which the parts were published ;
- (3) to enclose in square brackets a date or parts of a date where that date or part of a date can be determined only by reference to some other volume or work.

(30) *Article 25 (Priority to be accorded to a name published in a book or paper issued in instalments in cases where the name appears in one instalment and the description in another) :* Where a book is published in parts or a paper published in a journal appears in two or more parts, it sometimes happens that a new name appears in one instalment with little or no description and the description or the larger part of it appears on the following page in the next succeeding part. It has been suggested (Z.N.(S)352) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* to make clear the date as from which such a name ranks for priority. The question is of some importance, for there are cases where the two parts containing portions of a given description have been published at a considerable interval from one another. In consequence questions may arise regarding the relative priority of the name in relation to some other name for the same animal published during the intervening period. It is proposed to clarify this matter by the insertion in Article 25 of a provision that, where a new genus or species is described in a book or paper which is published in parts and the description of that genus or species appears partly in one part and partly in another, the name concerned ranks for the purpose of the Law of Priority as from the later of the two parts, except where the portion of the description contained in the earlier part is sufficient to comply with the provisos of Article 25.

(31) *Article 25, Proviso (c) (status of a specific or subspecific trivial name published after 31st December 1930 in combination with a generic name which does not satisfy the foregoing proviso) :* President Karl Jordan has suggested (Z.N.(S)315) that, in order to prevent any possibility of misunderstanding, it would be well to make it perfectly clear in the *Règles* that, where a specific name published after 31st December 1930 comprises a generic name which is invalid by reason of not complying with the requirements of proviso (c) to Article 25, the availability of the specific trivial name concerned is not affected, its status in this matter being exactly the same as that of a specific trivial name which, when first published, formed part of a specific name (binominal combination) which comprised a generic name which was invalid because it was a homonym of a previously published generic name. The same subject has also been considered by specialists in the Smithsonian Institution who have asked that a definite ruling may be given.

It would clearly be "ritualistic" in the highest degree to argue in favour of rejecting a specific trivial name solely on the ground that the generic name in combination with which it was originally published was an invalid name.



It is equally clear that it is desirable that there should be no ambiguity in this matter. It is accordingly recommended that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the status of a specific trivial name is not affected if the generic name in combination with which it was originally published is invalid either because it was published in conditions which did not satisfy the requirements laid down for generic names in Article 25 or because it is invalid under Article 34 by reason of being a homonym.

(32) "*Appendice*" (proposed addition of a section indicating how names derived from words belonging to languages using the Cyrillic alphabet should be transliterated into the Latin alphabet); The present *Appendice* (which for reasons given in paragraph 35 of the Annex to Paper I.C.(48)5 should in future be known as the Second Schedule to the *Règles*) contains a section (Section F) which indicates how names based upon words of Greek origin should be transliterated into the Latin alphabet. There is however no corresponding section in the *Appendice* relating to the transliteration of names derived from words belonging to languages which use the Cyrillic alphabet. This is an obvious weakness, for the latter rules are far less generally known than those which govern the transliteration of Greek words into the Latin alphabet. It is proposed that the International Congress should be asked to agree to the addition to the *Appendice* (=Second Schedule) of a section setting out the rules to be followed in transliterating into the Latin alphabet names based on words belonging to languages using the Cyrillic alphabet (Z.N.(S)310).

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the Commission,

Paris.

19th July, 1948.

## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

### PAPER

I.C.(48)15

#### MISCELLANEOUS PROPOSALS FOR THE AMENDMENT OR CLARIFICATION OF THE "RÈGLES": THIRD INSTALMENT

---

*Memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission*

In Paper I.C.(48)14 I circulated a second instalment of 12 miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. In the present paper I submit a third instalment of proposals of this kind. For convenience of reference, these are numbered consecutively with those enumerated in Paper I.C.(48)14.

#### Third instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the improvement of the "Règles" in various respects

(33) *Article 27 (need for adaptations to meet the nomenclatorial requirements of polymorphic Protozoa)*: This Article was drafted with reference to the Metazoa and, as pointed out by Dr. C. A. Hoare (London) (Z.N. (S) 291), is not in its present form altogether suitable for polymorphic species of Protozoa which have both sexual and asexual forms. It is suggested that to provide for cases of this kind, a new category, which might conveniently precede the existing category (a), should be inserted in this Article. It is suggested that this new category should read: "irrespective, in the case of a polymorphic species, of the form named."

(34) *Article 35, paragraph (3) (proposed addition of two further categories of names, differing slightly from one another, which should be treated as identical with one another)*: It has been proposed that the following additions should be made to the list of categories given in paragraph (3) of Article 35, as categories, words in which are to be treated as identical with one another:—

- (1) words having the terminations *-costa* and *-costata* (Z.N.(S)309);
- (2) words in which the semivowel or consonantal "i" has been transcribed as "ii," "y," "ei," "ej" or "ij" (Z.N.(S)198).

(35) *Article 4 (situation where the application of this Article would produce identical family names in different groups)*: This question was considered by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935 in relation to the family names to be formed from the generic names *Merops*, Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves) and *Merope* Newman, 1838 (Class Insecta). The Commission gave a decision in that case designed to prevent the establishment in two groups of family names consisting of the

same word (see *Opinion* 140). Commissioner Boschma has suggested (Z.N.(S.) 210) that a definite ruling of a general kind should now be given. It is accordingly proposed that, where compliance with the provisions of Article 4 leads, or appears to lead, to the establishment of two or more families having the same name, the case should be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, whose duty it shall be to determine the name to be applied to each of the families concerned.

(36) *Article 5 (situation when two or more families are united)*: The late Dr. Steven A. Corbet (British Museum (Natural History)) asked for a ruling on the question as to the action which should be taken in regard to the names of families when two genera, each the type of a family, are united in a single family by a subsequent reviser (Z.N.(S.)265). The question raised is whether the name of the united family so established should be based (1) upon the older of the two generic names in question or (2) upon the name of whichever of the genera concerned was first made the type of one of the families now united together. It is suggested that in conformity with the principles underlying the ruling given in *Opinion* 141 (see Point No. 1 in Paper I.C.(48)11) the *Règles* should provide that, where two or more families are united by a reviser, the name of the combined family so established should be based upon the name of whichever of the type genera concerned was first selected to be the type genus of a family.

(37) *Articles 3 and 4 (need for removing ambiguities due (1) to the failure in Article 3 to define the expression "Latin" and (2) to the ill-advised use in Article 4 of the highly technical expression "radical")*: Article 3 is defective since it ignores the fact that there is no such language as "Latin" pure and simple, that that language (like many other languages) has had a long history, that in the course of that history it has undergone numerous changes and therefore that it would be incorrect to attempt (as some authors have done) rigidly to apply to late-Latin and pseudo-Latin words the complex rules of grammar and philology which specialists have worked out as appropriate for Latin words of the classical period. When we turn to Article 4, we have to note that at the Graz Congress in 1910, it was decided, on the recommendation of the Commission, to substitute the word "stem" for the word "root" in the English version of the *Règles*. There is nothing to show whether, in recommending the foregoing change, the Commission thought that the English word "stem" was a more accurate translation of the word "radical" in the substantive French text (in which case they were in error) or whether their intention was to recommend the substitution of the word "thème" for the word "radical" in the substantive French text. If (as has been generally, though not universally, assumed) the action taken by the Graz Congress is to be interpreted in the second of these senses, it would, as pointed out by the eminent scholar, Professor L. W. Grensted of Oxford (Z.N.(S)313), when applied in connection with Article 4, produce such monstrosities in the way of family names (in the Class Insecta) as PLUSIALDAE and GRYLLOIDAE, the "stem" of the first declension noun *Plusia* being *Plusia-* and that of the second declension noun *Gryllus* being *Gryllo-*. The difficulties raised at present by these two



Articles reside in the fact :—

- (a) that Article 3 fails to recognise that the Latin language underwent many changes between the time, during the first millennium B.C., when it made its appearance and the close of the second millennium A.D., when at last it became a dead language for most purposes though not, *inter alia*, for those of the zoological and botanical nomenclature ; and
- (b) that Article 4 employs without explanation or comment a highly technical grammatical expression, the interpretation of which is a matter of difficulty even to learned classical scholars, working on the theoretical hypotheses of grammar and philology.

The only practicable way of overcoming these difficulties would be, as suggested by Professor Grensted, to provide that a family name shall be based upon the grammatical or classical "stem" or upon such part of it as would both show most clearly the relation between the family name on the one hand and on the other the name of the genus upon which it is based and would provide the simplest and most euphonious form consistent with that relationship. A solution on these lines would offer the great advantage that it would make it possible in almost every case to determine the correct form of a family name (1) by putting the name of the genus concerned into the genitive singular, (2) by cutting off the termination (-ae, -i, -is or -us according to the ordinary rules of Latin declension), and (3) by adding the termination -idae.

In the light of the foregoing considerations, it is here recommended that the Commission should invite the International Congress of Zoology to approve the following propositions :—

- (1) that a provision on the following lines be inserted in Article 3 :—

Care is to be taken in the interpretation of the present Article to pay due regard to the fact that Latin as used for scientific purposes is, and particularly Latin so used in the eighteenth century was, a living language and therefore that, while classical Latin is necessarily the standard to which scientific names should, so far as possible, conform, that standard is not to be applied in such a way as to ignore later developments in the language or as to override considerations of scientific accuracy, uniformity, intelligibility or practical usefulness.

- (2) that a provision on the following lines be added to Article 4:—

For the purpose of the present Article the expression "stem" is to be interpreted as meaning either (1) the grammatical or classical "stem" or (2) a part of the "stem" the choice to be made in favour of whichever of the foregoing methods both shows most clearly the relation between the generic name on the one hand and the name of the family on the other and provides the simplest and most euphonious form compatible with that relationship.

(38) Article 14, paragraph (1) (*adjectival trivial names to agree in gender with generic names*) : Article 14 requires that, when a specific trivial name is an adjective, it shall agree in gender with the generic name. This is an essential provision in any system of nomenclature which involves the use of an inflected language such as Latin. It was rigorously applied in the XVIIIth century by Linnaeus and his contemporaries who found no difficulty in so doing, for the words used as generic names by those authors were all words, the gender of which was known or could be readily determined. In the period of 190 years

which has elapsed since the publication in 1758 of the tenth edition of the *Systema Naturae*, the situation has been completely changed by the introduction of thousands of generic names consisting of neo-Latin or pseudo-Latin words, for which it is impossible to determine the gender which should be adopted. In spite of this development, there has been no corresponding evolution in the provisions of Article 14, in so far as those are concerned with the gender in which adjectival specific trivial names should be placed. This is unfortunate, for nothing is more calculated to bring a law into contempt than a failure to keep it abreast of current requirements. The problem is a difficult one. The following suggestions are necessarily not comprehensive but it is thought that their adoption and incorporation in the *Règles* will go some way towards bringing order into this difficult subject :—

- (a) where a generic name is a classical Latin word, the specific trivial name, if an adjective, should agree in gender with that name ;
- (b) where a generic name consists of a word which is unknown in classical Latin but is found in the later history of the Latin language, the specific trivial name, if an adjective, should agree in gender with the ascertained gender of the word selected as the generic name ;
- (c) where a generic name consists of a word unknown in any stage of the history of the Latin language except as used to-day for zoological nomenclature, the following rules should be observed :—
  - (i) if the word ends with any of the terminations used for nouns in classical or later Latin, the gender of the generic name shall be assumed to be the gender normally applicable to a noun having that termination ;
  - (ii) if the generic name has a termination not found in Latin other than Latin as used in zoological nomenclature, the gender of that noun shall be deemed to be masculine. (File Z.N.(S)352.)

(39) *Second Schedule (proposed insertion of an additional section)* : It is further suggested that for the convenience of those zoologists who have not had a classical education, there should be inserted in the Second Schedule of the *Règles* a concise statement of the rules which normally determine the gender of a Latin noun and a list of the better known of those nouns which are exceptions to the normal rule (Z.N.(S)352).

(40) *Article 25, proviso (c) (date as from which effective)* : The Congress agreed at Budapest that the operative date should be midnight G.M.T. 31st December 1930/1st January 1931. It is suggested that this should be inserted in this Article (Z.N.(S)352).

(41) *Second Schedule, Section G (proposed correction)* : Commissioner Boschma has pointed out (Z.N.(G)10) that the statement (paragraph 16) that "The soft aspirate may be used to represent the Arabic *ain*" is incorrect in that what is intended is not the soft aspirate but the *spiritus asper* or *esprit rude*. It is proposed that this error should be corrected.

(42) Article 14 (*status of trivial names consisting of unchanged modern patronymics*): (See *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 89): It is proposed to make it clear that a name such as "*cerisy*" is to be amended automatically to *cerisyi* and to retain the original author and date of publication (Z.N.(S)165).

(43) Article 14 (*trivial names consisting of phonetic reproductions of initials of zoologists*) (see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 89): It is proposed that words should be inserted in the *Règles*:—

(a) to make it clear:—

- (i) that a trivial name (like a generic name) may consist of a word composed of an arbitrary combination of letters,
- (ii) that, in consequence, a trivial name is not to be rejected on the ground that it consists of a phonetic reproduction of the initials of one or more zoologists (Z.N.(S)163);

(b) to insert a *Recommandation* that, where an author selects as a trivial name a word consisting of an arbitrary combination of letters, the combination so made should not be such that, when pronounced, it appears to be a word or combination of words in some language other than Latin (file Z.N.(S)352).

(44) Article 23 (*use of round brackets (parentheses) in cases where subgeneric names are used as well as generic names*) (See *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 91): It is proposed to make it clear (1) that the provisions in this Article apply only to cases where a generic name is changed and therefore that, where a subgeneric name is either changed or omitted, or, if no such name was used in the original description, such a name is later used, such a change does not lead to the use of brackets (parentheses) round an author's name, provided that the generic name remains unchanged (Z.N.(S)129) but that in every other case such a change is required (Z.N.(S)128); (2) that this Article does not apply to changes in the status of trivial names from specific to subspecific rank and *vice versa*.

(45) Article 25 *proviso (a)* (*question whether the description of the work of an animal constitutes an indication*) (See *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 93): Many fossil species and also gall-producing living species have been described first by their work. It is therefore proposed:—

- (1) to make it clear that a description of the work of an animal unaccompanied by a description of the animal itself constitutes an "indication";
- (2) to add a *Recommandation* urging authors, so far as possible, to avoid establishing new taxonomic units, based solely upon the work of the animals concerned (Z.N.(S)140).

(46) Article 25, *proviso (a)* (*generic names based upon figures only*) (See *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 94): It follows from the decision taken by the Commission during the present session to widen the meaning of the expression "indication" as applied to generic names published prior to 1st January 1931, that a generic name published before that date on a legend to a plate or plates but without explanatory matter is published with an "indication" (Z.N.(S)68).



(47) *Article 25 (authorship of names given conditionally)* (See *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 97): It is proposed to make it clear that, where a name is given conditionally and is later brought into use, the name dates from its original publication and is to be attributed to its original author (i.e. it does not date only from the later date when it was first definitely brought into use and is not to be attributed to the reviser by whom it was so brought into use). (Z.N.(S)45.)

(48) *Article 25 (question whether the citation, in connection with a parasitic species, of the name of its host constitutes an "indication")* (See *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 97): It is proposed to make it clear that the sole citation of a host species, like the sole citation of a type locality, does not constitute an "indication," but that, in the former case (as in the latter case), such a citation becomes an important part of the description of a species, where the name of that species is published with an indication. (Z.N.(S)167.)

(49) *Article 25 (expression "le plus anciennement designé")*: It is proposed to make it clear in the *Règles*:—

- (1) that the foregoing expression is to be interpreted rigorously, that is to say a name published on any given day of a given month has priority over another name published on the immediately following day;
- (2) that, where two names for one animal are found to have been published on the same day, the question of which name is to be given priority over the other is to be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. (Z.N.(S)125) (See *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1: 102.)

(50) *Articles 22 and 23 (proposed rejection of certain applications received)*: Some years before the war the Commission received applications for the deletion from the *Règles* of these Articles. These applications contained no grounds in support of the action proposed. In order to clear the records of the Commission, it is suggested that the Commission should now formally reject both these applications. (Z.N.(S)12 on p. 90 of volume 1 of the *Bulletin* and Z.N.(S)142 on page 93 of the same volume of the *Bulletin*.)

(51) *Article 25 (authorship of a name which when first validly published is either a manuscript name or a name already published as a nomen nudum)*: It is proposed to make it clear that in view of the fact that neither a manuscript name nor a *nomen nudum* has any standing under Article 25, a name belonging to either of these classes, when first published with an "indication", should be attributed to the author by whom it is so published. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(52) *Article 30, Rule (g) (interpretation)*: It is proposed to make it clear that for the purpose of this Rule, the type of a nominal genus has been selected not only where an author states that he is making such a selection but also where he clearly states that a given originally included nominal species is the type of the genus but at the same time indicates (incorrectly) that in making this statement he is doing no more than recording a previously established fact. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(53) *Title of the "Règles" as amended:* In order that there may be no ambiguity in the citation by authors of Articles of the *Règles* when these are published with the revisions now agreed upon, it is essential that authors should have a definite means of indicating that it is the revised edition to which they are referring. It is proposed therefore to follow the normal course in such a case and to insert at the end of the *Règles* a concluding Article stating that the title of these *Règles* is the "*Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique*, 1901-1948" and that they may be cited as such. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(54) *Recording of decisions by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature either* (1) *that a given work is not available for nomenclatorial purposes or* (2) *that a given name or class of name (e.g. such names as those dealt with in Opinion 124) is not available:* It is suggested that it would be more logical and would serve the convenience of zoologists if decisions by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on matters falling in the classes indicated above were to be recorded in a special schedule to be attached to the *Règles* just as decisions taken under the plenary powers are now so to be recorded. The last-named group of cases is to be incorporated in a First Schedule. It is now proposed:—

- (1) that the class of decisions here under consideration should be incorporated in a schedule to be known as the Second Schedule;
- (2) that the present *Appendice* should be known as the "Third Schedule" (instead of as the Second Schedule, as hitherto proposed) (Z.N.(S)352).

(55) *Article 4 (proposed amendment):* Article 4 provides that the name of a family is to be formed by adding the ending *idae*, and the name of a subfamily by adding *inae* to the stem of the name of its type genus. Professor Boschma proposes an addition to Article 4 prohibiting the use of names ending in *-idae* for supra-specific groups other than families, and names ending in *-inae* for supra-specific groups other than subfamilies. (Z.N.(S)200.)

(56) *Article 12 (proposed drafting amendment):* Article 12 provides that "a specific name becomes a subspecific name when the species so named becomes a subspecies, and vice versa." In view of the subjective nature of the taxonomic revision referred to in this Article, it is suggested that it would be more appropriate to re-word the Article as follows:—

"When an animal originally described as a species is treated by a later author as a subspecies, the specific trivial name of the species becomes the subspecific trivial name of the subspecies, and *vice versa*. (The substitution of "specific trivial name" and "subspecific trivial name" for "specific name" and "subspecific name" follows from the decision on point (5) in Paper I.C. (48)8, (Z.N.(S.) 352.)

(57) *Article 7 (proposed drafting amendment):* For reasons analogous to those given in point (56) above, it is suggested that Article 7 should be re-drafted as follows:—

"When a taxonomic unit originally described as a genus is treated by a later author as a subgenus, the generic name of the genus becomes the subgeneric name of the subgenus, and *vice versa*" (Z.N. (S.) 352).

(58) *Articles 6 and 11 (proposed co-ordination)*: There is a discrepancy between the French texts of Articles 6 and 11 which is undoubtedly due to a drafting slip and which it is suggested should be corrected in the revised edition of the *Règles*.

Article 6 states that "Les noms des genres et des sous-genres sont soumis aux mêmes règles; . . .," whereas Article 11 states that "Les noms spécifiques et subs spécifiques sont soumis aux mêmes règles et recommandations: . . ."

It is proposed to add "et recommandations" after "règles" in Article 6 (Z.N.(S)352).

(59) *Article 8, Second Recommendation, Section (b) (proposed amendment)*: This *Recommendation* states that if a compound Greek word is selected as a generic name, the attribute should precede the principal word. Examples are then given of words correctly joined in this way, but these are followed by the misleading and inaccurate statement quoted below:—

"On peut néanmoins admettre des mots formés sur le modèle du mot *Hippopotamus*, c'est-à-dire dans lesquels l'attribut est après le mot principal. Exemples: *Philydrus*, *Biorhiza*."

Professor Grensted (Z.N.(S)253) has pointed out:—

- (1) that the word "hippopotamus, though it does occur in late Greek, appears to be a local or even slang word, wrongly formed and without any parallel whatever in the Greek language . . . The word is at monstrous as the animal it represents, and it is therefore no model at all upon which to base intelligible generic names."
- (2) Point (b) in this *Recommendation* is philologically correct only when the attribute is truly adjectival, as in *Stenogyra* (=narrow whorl), i.e. narrow-whorled. But when the attribute expresses not a quality but an action, being in principle a verb-form, it may either precede or follow the other term in the partnership. Thus *Hydrophilus* means not a watery friend but a lover of water and *Philydrus* means exactly the same, both being equally correct.

It is proposed, therefore, to amend Point (b) in the second *Recommendation* to Article 8 as follows:—

- (1) Omit the second paragraph (i.e. the paragraph quoted above);
- (2) Amend the first paragraph to read:

"Compound Greek words in which, where the attribute expresses a quality, that word should precede the principal word but if it expresses either an action or an activity or a state, it may either precede or follow the word with which it is conjoined."

(60) "*Recommendation*" to Article 36 adopted at Padua, 1930: The Eleventh International Congress at Padua adopted an additional *Recommendation* to Article 36 stating that "when homonyms are of the same date, any name proposed for a genus takes precedence over a name (its homonym) proposed for a subgenus. The same principle is applicable to homonyms of species and subspecies of identical date." Clearly this provision should have been inserted in the mandatory paragraphs of Articles 34 and 35 and not adopted as a mere *Recommendation* to Article 36. (Indeed, in *Opinion* 124, it was (wrongly) referred to as an "amendment" to Article 36.)



It is proposed that the provision referred to above adopted at Padua in 1930 should be incorporated in the substantive parts of Articles 33 and 54 respectively. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(61) "*Opinion*" 124 (*proposed extension of application*): *Opinion* 124 states that under the *Règles* the various subdivisions of genera published by Linnaeus in 1758 are not to be accepted as of that date (1758) as of subgeneric value. It is desirable that it should be made clear that this decision carries with it similar treatment of names given to subdivisions of genera by Linnaeus in all subsequent editions of the *Systema Naturae*. It implies also that names given to subdivisions of genera by Fabricius should be treated in the same way, for the method adopted by these two authors is identical. It is proposed that this should now be made clear. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(62) *Status of names placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology"*: The names placed on the "*Official List*" are of two kinds:—(1) names validated by the Commission under their plenary powers and (2) names which are believed to be nomenclatorially available in every way but which have not been formally conserved by the use of the plenary powers. No change can be made in regard to entries relating to the first of these two classes but at present no special sanction applies to names belonging to the second class. This is an unnecessary weakness in the present system which impairs the utility of the "*Official List*." It is suggested that this situation should be rectified by the insertion in the *Règles* of a provision that, when a generic name has been placed on the "*Official List*," that name is to be used for the type species of the genus concerned and for any other species regarded as congeneric therewith and is not to be replaced by any other generic name, even if later evidence shows either that it is not an available name or is not the oldest name for the genus concerned or has as its type species some species other than the species so recorded in the "*Official List*" unless the Commission, on having the facts laid before it, shall so direct. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(63) *A suggested "Official List of Trivial Names in Zoology"*: The plenary powers Resolution of March 1913 refers (Article 3) to trivial names as well as to generic names, but no provision was made at that time for the recording of decisions relating to the first class of name, although as regards the second it was agreed to establish an "*Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*." It is proposed that this omission should be rectified by the establishment of an "*Official List of Trivial Names in Zoology*," subject to the same general conditions as those laid down in regard to the "*Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*." (Z.N.(S)352.)

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the Commission,  
Paris.

23rd July, 1948.

## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

## PAPER

I.C.(48)16

MISCELLANEOUS PROPOSALS FOR THE AMENDMENT OR CLARIFICATION  
OF THE "RÈGLES": FOURTH INSTALMENT

---

*Memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission*

In Paper I.C.(48)15 I circulated a third instalment of 31 miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. In the present paper I submit a fourth instalment of proposals of this kind. For convenience of reference these are numbered consecutively with those enumerated in Paper I.C.(48)15.

**Fourth Instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the improvement of the  
"Règles" in various respects**

(64) *Article 25 (position regarding trivial names when totally misleading)*: In some cases the trivial name of a species is so misleading that it has been suggested that it should be changed. Examples: (1) A Philippine Hesperid butterfly, wrongly labelled "California" was later described under the trivial name *californica*; (2) the Eire subspecies of the common European butterfly *Pieris napi* (Linnaeus) was given by a continental worker the trivial name *britannicus*, a choice repugnant to Irish nationalist sentiment; (3) a subspecies of the butterfly *Leptidea sinapis* (Linnaeus) from Syria was given the name *deserticola* in the mistaken belief that it occurred in the Syrian desert whereas in fact it occurs only in the hot damp valley of the Dog River near Beirut. It has been suggested by Mr. P. P. Graves (Eire) that there should be means for removing such anomalies and therefore that there should be added to the *Règles* a provision that where by reason of containing a reference to an erroneous locality or habitat a trivial name given to a species or subspecies is so misleading as to constitute a permanent cause of confusion, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature may, on the application of specialists in the group concerned, direct that the name be suppressed for all purposes other than the Law of Homonymy (Z.N.(S)205).

(65) "*Opinion*" 124 (*proposal supplementary to Proposal (61)*): Consequential upon the decision already taken to clarify the contents of *Opinion* 124, it is suggested that it should be made clear that the terms (consisting of adjectives in the nominative singular) inserted between the generic name and the specific trivial name of each species figured in the first volume of Hübner's *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* are not to be treated as subgeneric names as from the date of publication of that volume (Z.N.(S)218).

(66) *Proposed new Article relating to the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* : It has been proposed in paragraph 16 of Paper I.C.(48)6 that an Article should be inserted defining the functions, in relation to zoological nomenclature, entrusted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by the International Congress of Zoology. In the case of a number of Articles of the *Règles*, the Commission have now agreed that reference should be inserted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and for this reason alone it would be necessary to insert an Article defining the functions of the Commission. It is suggested that this Article should be based upon the definition of duties adopted by the Congress at its Fourth meeting held in Cambridge in 1898 supplemented by such later decisions as have since been taken by the Congress. These will be found set out on page V of volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. It is accordingly suggested that the Article relating to this matter should be on the following lines :

The centralisation, discussion and elaboration of all questions of zoological nomenclature is entrusted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") the duties of which include :—

- (1) the submission, as may be required, to the International Congress of Zoology (hereinafter referred to as the Congress) of recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, or for the insertion of additional provisions in, the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique* (hereinafter referred to as the "*Règles*") where, in its opinion, such amendments, clarifications or additions are required ;
- (2) the preliminary consideration on behalf of the Congress, for such period, not exceeding one year, as the Commission may decide, of every proposition relating to a proposed change in the *Règles* which may be submitted to the Congress from any source ;
- (3) the rendering of "*Opinions*" on questions of zoological nomenclature submitted to it, such *Opinions* to become operative forthwith without further reference to the Congress ;
- (4) the compilation of the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and of the "Official List of Trivial Names in Zoology."

The Commission possesses also plenary powers to suspend any part of the *Règles* as applied to the names in any book or to any individual name where in its opinion the strict application of the *Règles* would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity provided that the use of the said plenary powers shall be subject to the following conditions :—

[Here will be inserted the conditions provided in the Resolution of March, 1913 (Declaration 5) subject to the incorporation therein of the amendments thereto agreed upon during the present Congress.]

(67) *Status of a holotype or lectotype in relation to a poor indication or description* : It is proposed to make it clear in the *Règles* that, where a specific or subspecific name is published with a poor indication or description, the holotype of the species or subspecies or the lectotype, in cases where the species or subspecies concerned was originally based on a series of syntypes, is to be regarded as available to supplement the characters noted in the original description of the species or subspecies concerned (Z.N.(S)291).

(68) *Supplementary proposal on Point No. 30 in Paper I.C.(48)14*. This Point dealt with the status of names published in books or journals appearing in parts, in those cases where a portion of the original description of a new taxonomic unit appears in one part and the remainder in the next following part. It was not made sufficiently clear in that Point that, in the case of a



new generic name published subsequent to 31st December, 1930, it must be provided that no matter how much of the description appears in the earlier part, the name ranks for purposes of priority from the later part if the designation of the type species is not included in the earlier part. It is proposed that this should be made clear in the amendment to be made in the *Règles*.

(69) *Proposed introduction into nomenclature of the term "pseudo-genus"* : It was proposed by M. Deflandre (Section on Nomenclature, Saturday morning, July 24th, 1948) that there should be incorporated into the *Règles* a term "pseudo-genus" to denote all genera already or in future to be established where those genera are not monophyletic and that in future the expression "genus" should be restricted to those groups immediately above the species level which are monophyletic. A scheme of this kind would introduce into nomenclature a subjective element of a peculiarly intractable kind which could only give rise to argument and confusion. It is recommended that this proposal be rejected but this should not be held to prejudice the use of the expression "pseudo-genus" as a technical term. (Z.N.(S)363.)

(70) *Proposed adoption for certain fragments (organites and sclérites) of fossil species of invertebrates of a different nomenclature from that for living species* : Such a system had been proposed by M. Deflandre (Section on Nomenclature, 24th July), but the study of the Animal Kingdom as a whole would be greatly embarrassed if the nomenclature to be employed for identical grades were to differ according to whether the species concerned were living species or fossil species. Moreover, the introduction for palæozoology of a nomenclature different from that used for zoology would menace the unity of the present system of nomenclature which applies equally to the whole Animal Kingdom and makes no distinction between living and extinct species. It is suggested that the proposal which has been submitted on this subject be rejected, without prejudice to the use in this or other cases of a special technical terminology by way of supplement to, but not in replacement of, the rules of zoological nomenclature. (Z.N.(S)364.)

(71) *Interpretations of the "Règles" by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* : It is proposed to make it clear in the *Règles* that where at any time between meetings of the Congress the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, acting in virtue of the judicial functions entrusted to it, gives an interpretation of the meaning of a given provision in the *Règles*, the interpretation so given shall immediately upon being published in a *Declaration* of the Commission have like force and vigour as though it had been embodied in the *Règles* until the next succeeding meeting of the Congress, at which meeting the question whether an amendment to the *Règles* shall be made in the sense of the said interpretation shall be submitted for decision. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(72) *Method of amending the "Règles"* : There is a general desire for a clear statement as to the manner in which amendments may be made in the *Règles*. It is accordingly proposed that an Article should be inserted stating that amendments in, or additions to, the *Règles* can only be made by the

International Congress of Zoology on the recommendation of the Section on Nomenclature at meetings at which such a Section is established but that no decision on a proposition that such an amendment or addition be so made may be taken unless the proposition has been submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for a period of at least one year from the opening of the Congress concerned or for such less a period as in any given case the Commission may agree is sufficient (Z.N.(S)352).

(73) *Article 35 (proposal supplementary to Proposal (34) in Paper I.C.(48)15)*: It has been suggested that the Commission should agree to recommend the Congress to insert in the *Règles* a *Recommandation* that authors should refrain from publishing in the same genus trivial names differing from one another only by the terminations *-costa* and *-costata*. It is proposed to add to this "*Recommandation*" a corresponding recommendation in regard to the use of trivial names differing from one another only by the terminations *-cauda* and *-caudata* (Z.N.(S)309).

(74) *Article amending and embodying the Plenary Powers Resolution, 1913*: Through inadvertence it was proposed in Paper I.C.(48)4 (paragraph 6(2) (a)) that the resolution relating to the establishment of co-operation between the Commission and specialist bodies which was added by the Monaco Congress as a final paragraph to the Plenary Powers Resolution should be incorporated in the Article now to be inserted in the *Règles*. The subject matter of this paragraph has no relevance to the grant to the Commission of plenary powers and it was never intended to recommend that it should be incorporated in the *Règles*. It is accordingly proposed that the foregoing paragraph in Paper I.C.(48)4 and the decision thereon should be amended accordingly.

(75) *The problem of "neotypes" (proposed cancellation of certain sentences in "Opinion" 128)*: No decision on this question has ever been reached by the Commission and they have agreed during the present meeting that this problem shall be made the subject of a special study by the Secretary to the Commission in consultation with interested specialists. As has been pointed out by Commissioner Harold E. Vokes, it is unfortunate therefore that there should have been inserted in *Opinion* 126 (relating to the new names in d'Orbigny's "*Prodrome*") the series of *obiter dicta* by the author of that *Opinion* which appears on page 21 of the edition published by the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., on behalf of the Commission in 1936 and which have the appearance of constituting a decision by the Commission on this important question, whereas in fact the only matter on which a vote was taken by the Commission in this, as in other *Opinions*, was the matter indicated in the draft "Summary" then submitted. That "Summary" dealt with the matter which alone was at that time under consideration by the Commission and rightly contained no reference to the views expressed in the passage which occurs on page 21 of the printed edition. This misleading way of recording the individual views of the draftsman of an *Opinion* has already caused a certain amount of inconvenience in the consideration of the problem whether, and, if so, under what conditions "neotypes" should be recognised. In order to

prevent any further harm being done by *Opinion* 126, it is now proposed that the Commission should (1) confirm the decision as recorded in the "Summary" of *Opinion* 126 and (2) cancel, so far as concerns the interpretation of the *Règles*, all observations contained in the body of that *Opinion* but not in the "Summary."

(76) *Article 8, second "Recommendation" section (b)*: When considering Paper I.C.(48)15, the Commission adopted the proposals in regard to this matter submitted under Point No. (59). A new wording for the *Recommendation* was then agreed upon but no examples were included in the draft then adopted. It is proposed to insert the name *Stenogyra* as an example of the first part of section (b) of this *Recommendation* and to insert the names *Hydrophilus* and *Philydrus* as examples of the second part of this section of this *Recommendation* (Z.N.(S)253).

(77) *Proposed insertion of paragraph numbers where an Article consists of more than one paragraph*: The foregoing recommendation, which is purely a matter of presentation, is submitted since experience (including experience at the present Congress) has shown that the discussion of a given Article consisting of more than one paragraph is seriously hampered unless the paragraphs in question are referred to in this way. Moreover in the case of at least one Article (Article 14) the most ludicrous misquotation is commonly made as the result of the paragraphs being at present unnumbered. This Article consists of three paragraphs of which the first is a sentence subdivided into three phrases lettered "a," "b" and "c." As a result both paragraph (2) and paragraph (3) are commonly referred to in the literature as paragraph (c), though, as explained above, the phrase lettered "c" is not a paragraph at all, being no more than a fragment of paragraph (1).

(78) *Proposed subdivision into paragraphs of Articles containing a number of sentences, each prescribing a separate regulation*: For reasons similar to those explained in (77) above, it is proposed to treat as separate paragraphs provisions dealing with separate matters which now appear as separate sentences in a single Article. Example: Article 1 of the substantive French text contains three separate sentences, each dealing with a different question. These are compressed into two sentences in the incorrect English translation now currently in use. Under the present proposal each of those three sentences will become a separate paragraph in this Article. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(79) *Article 30, Rule (e) (meaning of the expression "species inquirenda")*: In order to allay a doubt which has been expressed to the Commission (Z.N.(S)236), it is proposed that it should be made clear in the *Règles* that for the purpose of this Rule a species is a "*species inquirenda*" if the author of a genus is doubtful of the taxonomic status of the nominal species concerned (either because the species is unknown to him or because of difficulties of identifying it). This expression does not mean that the author was doubtful whether the species in question was correctly referable to the genus concerned, that question being provided for in the immediately following subsection of this Rule.



(80) Article 30, proposed addition of a "Recommendation" urging authors not to use the expression "genotype": The expression genotype is now widely used by geneticists in a sense totally different from that in which it is sometimes used in zoological nomenclature (i.e. in the sense of the type species of a genus). The use of this expression in zoological nomenclature is much less frequent than formerly and, in order to avoid confusion, it would be useful if a *Recommendation* were added to Article 30 urging authors not to use that expression when referring to the type species of a genus. It is recommended that the Commission should now agree to the insertion of a *Recommendation* in this sense. (Z.N.(S)352.)

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the Commission,  
Paris.

24th July, 1948.

## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

## PAPER

I.C.(48)17

MISCELLANEOUS PROPOSALS FOR THE AMENDMENT OR CLARIFICATION  
OF THE "RÈGLES": FIFTH INSTALMENT

---

*Memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission*

In Paper I.C.(48)16 I circulated a fourth instalment of 17 miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. In the present paper I submit a fifth instalment of proposals of this kind. For convenience of reference, these are numbered consecutively with those enumerated in Paper I.C.(48)16.

Fifth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the improvement of the  
"Règles" in various respects

(81) *The plenary powers in relation to particular purposes* : It is very clear from the discussions in the Section on Nomenclature and from the communications received from various sources (including the communications received from the Danish and Austrian zoologists) that there is a very widespread desire that steps should be taken to include in the *Règles* provisions to prevent the upsetting of well-known and commonly used names solely upon bibliographical grounds. The Commission have undertaken to study this question and submit a report to the next meeting of the Congress. On the main issue involved, clearly no action is possible at the present Congress but there is one direction in which it is in the power of the Commission to meet the general wish of zoologists. This would be by recommending the Congress to include in the Article in which the plenary powers resolution is to be incorporated a new provision (analogous to that agreed upon at the meeting of the Section on Nomenclature held on Friday, 23rd July in relation to names of importance to medicine, veterinary science, agriculture, etc.) in which the Commission would be enjoined to give special consideration to applications for the use of their plenary powers when those applications are concerned either :—

- (1) to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes some old long-forgotten work containing new names the introduction of which would sink in synonymy names that are well established in current use;
- (2) to suppress any old but hitherto forgotten name in any book where the introduction of that name at the present time would sink in synonymy some well-known name in current use. (Z.N.(S)352.)

This is a modest proposal but it is, I am convinced, of a nature calculated to strengthen the hands of the Commission in dealing with cases of this kind. As such it is of value and it would, I believe, be widely welcomed. I accordingly recommend it to the Commission for adoption.

(82) *The plenary powers in relation to cases of confusion arising from uncertainty as to how to apply the "Règles"*: At the time when the plenary powers were granted to the Commission, the preoccupation of all zoologists was centred upon the question of the strict application of the *Règles* and of the effects of such an application in given cases. It had not at that time been as fully apparent that, even where all concerned were agreed in favour of the strict application of the *Règles*, cases would occasionally arise where owing to the impossibility of determining with certainty to which of two or more species a given trivial name should be applied, a serious and irremediable state of confusion would arise unless powers were given to the Commission definitely to remove all such doubts by declaring under their plenary powers to which species in such a case a given trivial name should apply. Now that some 35 years later a general effort has been made in many groups strictly to apply the *Règles*, it has been found that in a number of important cases it is impossible to apply those *Règles* with precision owing to the doubts which exist as to the correct application of some well-known specific trivial name.

These doubts are to-day a potent source of uncertainty and instability and every zoologist with whom this matter has been discussed is agreed that authority should be given to the Commission to use their plenary powers to settle such cases or, if it is held that this authority has already been granted under the existing powers, that that authority should be more explicitly expressed.

It is accordingly recommended that the Commission should invite the Section on Nomenclature and, through it, the Congress to approve an extension of the existing plenary powers to cover not only (as at present) cases where greater confusion than uniformity would clearly result from the strict application of the *Règles* but also cases where, in the absence of the use of such powers, confusion is likely to persist through the impossibility of determining the manner in which, under a strict application of the *Règles*, a given specific trivial name should be applied. (Z.N.(S)352.)

(83) *The composition of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*: Now that it has been decided to include in the *Règles* an Article relating to the functions of the Commission, it is necessary also to include an Article dealing with the composition of the Commission and the method of electing its members. It is suggested that this Article should be in general terms and should provide:—

- (1) that the Commission shall consist of such number of persons not being less than 18 as the Congress or the Commission acting on its behalf may from time to time determine;
- (2) that one third of the members of the Commission shall be elected by the Congress at each of its meetings for such periods and subject to such conditions as may from time to time be imposed by the Congress;



- (3) that the Congress may determine from time to time the number of officers of the Commission and the titles and duties of such officers and may elect members of the Commission to hold the offices so established ;
- (4) that during periods between meetings of the Congress the Commission may, subject to maintaining the number specified in (1) above, vary the number of members and may elect zoologists to fill additional places so created and may also fill casual vacancies which may occur during such periods through death, resignation or otherwise, such elections being made for such periods and subject to such conditions as the Commission may from time to time prescribe ;
- (5) that, if, as the result of an emergency, the Congress is prevented from holding its normal periodical meetings, the Executive Committee of the Commission (consisting of the officers of the Commission) may assume and exercise such extraordinary powers as it may consider necessary to secure the continued existence of the Commission, provided :—
  - (a) that the powers so assumed shall not include the power to vary the *Règles* ;
  - (b) that at the first meeting of the Congress after the end of such emergency the Commission shall submit a report to the Congress regarding the extraordinary powers assumed during the emergency and the action taken by the Executive Committee thereunder ;
- (6) that in filling places in the Commission due regard is to be paid by the Congress or the Commission, as the case may be, to the need for securing (a) that there is an appropriate balance in the membership of the Commission as between different parts of the world and (b) that there is an appropriate representation of different types of knowledge and experience (i) in the various branches of the Animal Kingdom as respects both living and fossil species and also (ii) of the needs of workers not only in the field of systematic zoology but also in the applied fields concerned with biological subjects.

(84) *By-Laws of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:* The insertion in the *Règles* of an Article relating to the composition and functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature makes it necessary also to insert an Article regarding the manner in which the Commission is to conduct its business. It is suggested that this should be done by the insertion of an Article providing :—

- (1) that the procedure and other matters concerned with the conduct of the affairs of the Commission shall be governed by By-Laws to be adopted by the Commission ;
- (2) that these By-Laws shall contain provisions giving effect to every provision included in the *Règles* which prescribes either the composition or functions of the Commission and that the Articles dealing with those matters are to be Organic Articles and therefore not subject to change except in so far as the Congress may from time to time vary the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the composition and functions of the Commission ;

- (3) that, in addition to the Organic Articles, the Commission may include in their By-Laws such provisions as they may consider necessary relating (i) to the election of officers and the duties to be assigned to each such officer, (ii) to the election of members of the Commission, (iii) to the election of an Executive Committee, its composition and the functions to be entrusted thereto, (iv) to the methods to be followed in voting on matters requiring decisions and (v) generally to any other matter concerning the conduct of the business of the Commission ;
- (4) that, subject to (2) above, the Commission may at any time vary its By-Laws to such extent and subject to such conditions as it may from time to time decide ;
- (5) that the Commission should arrange for the International Trust on Zoological Nomenclature, the corporation formed to carry out all financial duties on behalf of the Commission, to print its By-Laws and at all times to place supplies thereof on sale.

(85) *Article 28 as applied both to generic and to trivial names*<sup>1</sup>. There is so much doubt in the minds of zoologists as to the position under the *Règles* in this matter and there is in consequence such diversity of practice that it is, I think, essential that the Commission should agree to insert words into this Article expressly stating either what is the position or, if the *Règles* are to be altered, what the position is to be. At present this Article leaves it to the first reviser to choose which of any two or more generic names should be accepted in preference to the other or others when all the names in question are published in the same book or journal and the parts of that book or journal containing the names in question are published simultaneously. This Article, read in conjunction with Article 31, appears to mean that, where two nominal species are united on taxonomic grounds and the names of these nominal species were published in the same book, the choice as to which of the trivial names in question shall in future be the name of the combined species rests with the first reviser.

On the other hand, we know :—

- (1) that the determination of the question who is the first reviser often involves a laborious search of the literature and that, even when this search has been made, it is often a matter of doubt whether a given passage in a given work constitutes an act by a "first reviser" ;
- (2) that a large and increasing number of zoologists ignores the present provisions of Article 28 as applied to a combined species by calling in aid the principle of page precedence and, if necessary, that of line precedence, a method which gives a quick and clear-cut answer to the question of the name to be adopted ;
- (3) that the Commission itself has inclined towards the principle of page precedence, having thought it necessary in two cases to use its plenary powers to protect a generic name, in the first of these cases (*Opinion*

<sup>1</sup> Point (85) constitutes the Report on this subject which at the Ninth Meeting of their Paris Session the Commission requested the Secretary to prepare for their consideration.

156) (*Vanessa* Fabricius) against another generic name (*Cynthia* Fabricius) published higher up on the same page of the same work, and in the second case (*Opinion* 167) to protect a name (*Euthalia* Hübner) against a name (*Symphædra* Hübner) published on an earlier page of the same work.

In these circumstances it cannot be claimed that the position as it exists to-day under the *Règles* is free from doubt. In my view, the factors calling for special consideration are :—

- (a) that a large and increasing number of zoologists applies the principle of page and line precedence ;
- (b) that this system is infinitely easier to operate than that of the first reviser, and
- (c) that on two occasions the Commission have used their plenary powers on the assumption that page and line precedence constitute the rule.

These are grounds in favour of the insertion in this Article of a clear-cut provision stating definitely that, where the names of two or more nominal genera or of two or more nominal species are published simultaneously in the same book or journal and a later reviser decides to unite the nominal genera or nominal species as the case may be, the name to be adopted for the combined genus or species so established is to be determined by the application of the principle of page precedence and, if necessary, that of line precedence, it being understood that if the application of this rule creates a really hard case, that case will be remedied by the use of the plenary powers. If the Commission take the opposite view, then they should, I think, state clearly in Article 28 that the principle of page and line precedence is not to be invoked. In that case they should, I think, be prepared to use their plenary powers to remedy any hard cases so created. My belief is that the number of hard cases is likely to be smaller if the principle of page and line precedence is invoked than if the opposite principle is affirmed. For this reason and because of the much greater simplicity and certainty secured by the principle of page and line precedence, I hope that the Commission will adopt this principle. In any case, a clarification of Article 28, in one direction or another, is absolutely essential.

(86) *Règles, First Schedule (scope)* : We have agreed to include in the First Schedule particulars relating to all cases where the Commission use their plenary powers. It is just as important, however, formally to record cases where the use of the plenary powers has been refused. It is therefore proposed :

- (a) that the scope of the First Schedule should be enlarged to this extent ; and
- (b) that the Standing Orders of the Commission should provide for the automatic cancellation of *Opinions* relating to the use of the plenary powers as and when the decisions recorded therein are inscribed in the First Schedule.

(87) *Règles, Second Schedule (supplementary proposals)*: This has been established for the reception of particulars of decisions taken by the Commission



when not acting under their plenary powers when those decisions relate to the status of books. It is recommended :—

- (a) that the scope of this Schedule should be extended to cover also all decisions in regard to individual names taken by the Commission in *Opinions* other than under the plenary powers ;
- (b) that the Standing Orders of the Commission should provide for the automatic cancellation of every *Opinion* falling in the class specified in (a) above as from the date on which the decision recorded therein is inscribed in the Second Schedule.

(88) *The Official Lists of Generic and Specific Names in Zoology in relation to the " Règles "*: It is proposed :—

- (a) that there should be two further Schedules to the *Règles* established forthwith, namely :
  - (i) a Fourth Schedule for the reception of the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;
  - (ii) a Fifth Schedule for the reception of the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :
- (b) that, in order to prevent the *Règles* from being unduly bulky the Fourth and Fifth Schedules should be published separately from time to time in Parts ;
- (c) that on the forthcoming publication of the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the volume so published shall constitute the Fourth Schedule to the *Règles*, and that, as from the date of its publication, all the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission in relation to the names recorded in the said Schedule as having been entered upon the *Official List* should be cancelled ;
- (d) that as and when a sufficient number of specific names has been placed on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*, that *Official List* shall be published in like manner to that prescribed in (c) above and the relevant *Opinions* thereupon cancelled.

(89) *Proposed cancellation of certain " Opinions " which contain no effective decision or, by reason of their transitory character, have now lost all significance:* It is proposed that the following *Opinions* falling in the above classes should be cancelled in whole or in part :—

- (a) *Opinion* 9. (No effective decision.)
- (b) *Opinions* 23 and 24 Both these *Opinions* should be cancelled, as each states that a certain generic name proposed by the non-binominal author Commerson is an available name. If so desired by specialists, the Commission can later validate the names in question under their plenary powers.
- (c) *Opinion* 32. The statement in this *Opinion* is correct but is now irrelevant in view of the fact that the Commission has since designated *Sphex flavipennis* Fabricius as the type species of the genus *Sphex* under their plenary powers.

- (d) *Opinion* 44. The *Opinion* falls to the ground owing to the suppression of Gronovius 1763, by *Opinion* 89.
- (e) *Opinion* 74. This is concerned only with the rejection of a proposal on procedure submitted by Commissioner Apstein.
- (f) *Opinion* 76. The following action is needed :—
  - (1) cancel the first sentence ;
  - (2) insert the content of the second sentence in the Fourth Schedule ;
  - (3) cancel the third sentence because the conclusion here indicated has already been superseded by *Opinion* 80 ;
  - (4) cancel the remainder of the " Summary."
- (g) *Opinion* 83. The first sentence will now be clearly stated in the *Règles* and should be omitted from the Fourth Schedule.
- (h) *Opinion* 88. The interpretative portion is now to be incorporated in the *Règles*. The remainder should be inserted in the Fourth Schedule, subject to the substitution of the word " available " for the word " valid."
- (i) *Opinion* 102. The interpretative element is now to be incorporated in the *Règles*. The remainder is concerned with taxonomy and not nomenclature and for this reason and because it does no more than state the obvious, it should not be included in the Fourth Schedule.
- (j) *Opinion* 107. It is proposed that, as regards this very bad *Opinion*, the only portion to be entered in the Fourth Schedule should be the last two lines of the " Summary."
- (k) *Opinion* 113. The date " 1802 " should be corrected, for Latreille's volume is dated according to the French Revolutionary Calendar (running from September to September).
- (l) *Opinion* 133. This *Opinion* is unnecessary as it is completely covered by the general principles enumerated in *Opinion* 141.

(90) *Supplementary decisions needed in regard to matters dealt with in certain " Opinions " before the contents of those " Opinions " can usefully be inserted in Schedules to the " Règles " :—*

- (a) *Opinion* 31. The decision in this *Opinion* which was published in 1910 is incorrect. This was pointed out in 1911 by Stejneger in a footnote incongruously inserted at the foot of the first page of *Opinion* 38. The error in *Opinion* 31 has never been formally corrected and this needs now to be done.
- (b) *Opinions* 68 and 69. These *Opinions* are concerned with the types of the genera *Pleuronectes* Linnæus, 1758, and *Sparus* Linnæus, 1758 (Class Pisces). These *Opinions* are most unhelpful, for they state only that an author (Fleming, 1828) did not fix the types of these genera. It is recommended

that immediate steps should be taken by the Commission to determine, in consultation with specialists, what are the types of these genera and that, having done so, they should insert these particulars in the Third Schedule, at the same time cancelling *Opinions* 68 and 69.

- (c) *Opinion* 97. Hübner's *Tentamen*: It would be impossible to include in the Third Schedule the tortuous and evasive statement given in the "Summary" of this *Opinion*. It is proposed therefore clearly to state that Hübner's *Tentamen* was not published within the meaning of Article 25 and that therefore the new names in it have no availability as from the date (1806) on which this sheet was distributed by its author. (The decision in this *Opinion* is agreeable now to the vast majority of specialists, there now being only a minute handful who support the *Tentamen* and these only in respect of a few of the names included in it.)
- (d) *Opinion* 78. Name of the Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever Tick and and
- (e) *Opinion* 99. *Endamoeba* versus *Entamoeba*: Both these *Opinions* are very poor, have been the subject of much criticism, and have been re-submitted by specialists for further consideration. It is accordingly proposed :—
  - (a) that the Commission should announce that the matters dealt with in these two *Opinions* should be treated as *sub judice*: and
  - (b) that, pending a review of the problems involved, the contents of neither of these *Opinions* should be entered in the Fourth Schedule to the *Règles*.
- (f) *Opinion* 129. This *Opinion* suppresses *Bipinnaria*, etc., as generic names but adds that they are available as technical designations for developmental stages of the Echinoderms concerned. It is recommended that the Commission should make it clear that, although *Bipinnaria* and the other names concerned as proposed by Sars are suppressed as generic names, they retain their status under Article 34 and therefore make it impossible for these names to be validly used for other genera in the Animal Kingdom.
- (g) " *Opinions* " suppressing generic names under the plenary powers In some *Opinions* the Commission have suppressed a generic name in order to clear the way for the validation of the same name as used at a later date, while in other *Opinions* they have suppressed a generic name in order to validate some other name for the same genus. It is recommended that in every case falling in the first class the name suppressed should be suppressed absolutely so far as concerns its publication by the author and in the work cited, but that a name falling in the second class, while being suppressed for purposes of availability,



should nevertheless retain its position under Article 34, thus making it impossible for the name to be validly used for some other genus (a course which would clearly give rise to confusion and run counter to the intention of the Commission at the time when they took the decisions in question).

(91) *Errors in certain "Opinions" requiring correction before the contents of those "Opinions" are inserted in the Schedules to the "Règles."* It is proposed :—

- (a) that when any name on which a decision has been given in an *Opinion* is transferred to one of the Schedules to the *Règles* :
  - (i) the name should be correctly cited and its bibliographical reference inserted ;
  - (ii) in the case of a specific trivial name, the original generic name (frequently omitted in the older *Opinions*) should be inserted.
- (b) that if, when the Secretary to the Commission re-examines the *Opinions* with a view to the transfer of their contents to the Schedules, he should find other errors or obscurities than those specified in Points (89) and (90) above, the Commission should treat as a matter of urgency the correction of such errors in order not to hold up the publication of the revised edition of the *Règles* and that to this end all procedural delays should be eliminated under suspension of the by-laws.

(92) *Gender of names on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology":* It is suggested that the Commission should agree :—

- (1) that the gender of every generic name placed on the "Official List" should be indicated in the alphabetical index to that list when published ;
- (2) that it be a standing instruction that whenever in future a generic name is placed on the "Official List," its gender be at the same time recorded therein.

(93) *Date of entry into force of the "Règles" as revised:* When the *Règles* were adopted in 1901, it took three and a half years before the text was published. It is proposed on this occasion to act with the utmost despatch. All zoologists will naturally wish to know as soon as possible, and also to act as soon as possible on, the changes and other modifications which have now been agreed upon.

It is accordingly proposed :—

- (1) that the Minutes of the meetings of the Paris Session setting out in detail all the decisions taken shall be published at the earliest possible moment in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* together with (1) the supporting I.C.(48) papers and (2) the Report, now to be submitted to the Congress by the Commission ;

- (2) that when the foregoing documents are published as in (1) above, they should be prefaced by a short note explaining the arrangements in hand for the early publication of the revised *Règles* and advising all authors thenceforward to proceed as though the revised *Règles* containing the said changes were already published ;
- (3) that the *Règles*, as amended by the Paris Congress, shall formally enter into force as from the date on which they are published on behalf of the Congress by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature ;
- (4) that an Article be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing the date of entry into force as in (3) above.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the Commission.

Paris.

24th July, 1948.

## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

## PAPER

I.C.(48)18

MISCELLANEOUS PROPOSALS FOR THE AMENDMENT OR CLARIFICATION  
OF THE "RÈGLES": SIXTH INSTALMENT

---

*Memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission*

I circulate herewith for the consideration of the Commission a sixth instalment of miscellaneous proposals, some of which are concerned with the amendment of the *Règles*, while others relate to matters of a more general character. The fifth instalment was circulated as Paper I.C.(48)17.

Sixth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the improvement of the  
"Règles" in various respects

(94) *Case of identical trivial names published in different genera bearing the same name:* Commissioner Bradley has raised the question of the treatment to be accorded to two identical trivial names given to species in different genera when those genera bear the same name. In Paper I.C.(48)8 these cases were covered in the definition of "primary homonym," i.e., by the words "the same combination of generic and trivial names," though the definition of secondary homonyms was restricted to cases of identical trivial names placed in the same genus (i.e., it does not cover the case of identical trivial names placed in different genera which have the same name). It seems to me that specific homonyms (whether primary or secondary) which arise solely through the existence of generic homonyms (i.e., through the fact that Article 34 has not been complied with) constitute a special case and should not call for the replacement of the junior trivial name, since once Article 34 has been complied with, this would be totally unnecessary. It is suggested therefore that the definition of specific homonyms (both primary and secondary) for the purposes of the proposals contained in Paper I.C.(48)8 should be restricted to cases of identical trivial names either originally published, or subsequently placed, *in the same genus*, and that a provision should be added stating that, where species bearing identical trivial names are either originally published, or are subsequently placed in different genera and those genera bear the same name, the junior generic name should be replaced (as required by Article 34) but that the junior trivial name is not to be replaced (Z.N.(S)80).

(95) *Article 25, proviso (a) (meaning of the expression "indication") (proposal supplementary to Proposal (18) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11):* At the very end of this paragraph there is a loophole. As things now stand, it would



be possible validly to replace an invalid trivial name without giving any description or figure or a reference to such figure even if the name to be replaced was a *nomen nudum*. This is of course no more than a slip and it is proposed to remedy it by inserting at the end of the sentence the words "where that name was a name which had originally been published with an indication."

(96) *Consolidation of decision in "Opinion" 46 (proposal supplementary to Proposal (39) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11)*: There is another slip here. As drafted, the "summary" of *Opinion* 46 contemplates a situation in which, when species are first placed in a genus which was originally published without any species being cited by name, only one such species is cited. In that case, as stated in the words used, that species would automatically become the type of the genus concerned. But this form of words leaves unprovided for the case where on the first occasion on which any species are cited by name as belonging to the genus the names of two or more species are cited. It is proposed to remedy this defect by inserting words to the effect that where, on the occasion on which for the first time the name of a species is cited as being referable to a genus in which, when first established, no species was cited by name or recognisably described without a name and on that occasion two or more nominal species are so cited, these nominal species become for purposes of nomenclature the originally included species and are therefore the species from which alone a subsequent author, acting under Rule (g) of Article 30, can select the type species of the genus.

(97) *Article 30, Rule (g) (to be applied rigorously)*: It has sometimes happened that a given generic name was introduced in a particular book but that for some reason contemporary authors treated the use of the name either by the same author or by some other author in some other book published either after or earlier (e.g., in the case of pre-1758 names) as the place where the name was first published or, where they have not actually done this, they have proceeded, when selecting the type under Rule (g) in Article 30, to argue that account can be taken of species included by the author in books other than that in which the name was first validly published under Article 25. Alternatively, it has been argued that, where an author states that species "X" is the type of genus *A-us* Linnaeus, 1735, that action constitutes a valid type designation for *A-us* Linnaeus, 1758. On a number of occasions, illogicalities of this kind have led to confusion and error and it is proposed that the *Règles* should make it clear that, where an author selects a species to be the type of a genus as of an author and/or as of a date other than the original author of the genus or other than as from the book in which the name was first validly published, the so-called type-selection so made does not comply with the requirements of Rule (g) in Article 30, it being necessary for the purpose of that Rule that a subsequent author selecting the type of a nominal genus should have under consideration for this purpose only the first occasion on which the generic name in question was validly published under Article 25. (This is necessary, since otherwise it might be possible to select as the type of a genus a species not included in the original (post-1757) publication of the generic name or to ignore a valid type designation by some other author on the ground that the species so selected was not an originally included species.)

(98) *Cases where a series of subspecies is enumerated, each preceded by a serial letter:* Old authors used sometimes to list (usually as "varietates") the subspecies of a species, and, when doing so, place a letter ("a," "b," "c," etc.) before each "var." in turn. It has sometimes been argued that these letters form part of the name of the subspecies, where that name was first introduced in such circumstances. This is a misconception and it is proposed that this should be made clear in the *Règles*.

(99) *Date of entry into force of the "Règles" as amended:* A proposal on this subject is included in I.C.(48)20 (draft report). It is suggested that the Commission should reach a decision on this question when they come to consider that paper.

(100) *Article 34 (generic names) and Article 35 (trivial names), a special case:* An implicit result of the Commission's ruling in *Opinion* 116 is that a generic name ending in "-nus" is not to be treated as being identical with one ending in "-mus." This implication was inadvertently not noted when I.C.(48)11 was being prepared. It is suggested that this decision (which would cover also generic names ending in (1) -ma and -na, and (2) -mum and -num) should be incorporated in the *Règles* and *Opinion* 116 at the same time cancelled for interpretative purposes.

(101) *Article 25 (Point (12) in I.C.(48)11 (nomina nuda)):* It would be well to make it clear that (i) a name which has been published without an indication or (ii) has been published in a work found not to be available is, on being later published with an indication, in exactly the same position as a manuscript name when so published.

(102) *Article 25 (status of generic names cited in specific synonymies):* We have now made clear the position as regards trivial names previously not validly published or previously not published at all, when those names are published in synonymies and it is possible therefore to attach a definite meaning to them. There remains one other class of case, namely, where in the synonymy of a species an author cites, but does not adopt, a binominal combination (specific name), the *nomen genericum* comprised in which has either never been published or is a name which has been published only by a non-binominal author (either before or after 1758). We have already covered the second of these classes (names by non-binominal authors) in Point (20) in Paper I.C.(48)11. Names of genera belonging to the other class (generic names cited in specific synonymies where the generic name has either not previously been published or has been published in conditions which do not satisfy Article 25) are usually ignored, and, I think, rightly so. I accordingly recommend that the *Règles* should make it clear that generic names published in such circumstances acquire thereby no rights under the Law of Priority.

(103) *Generic names first published in generic synonymies:* It is not at present clear in the *Règles* what are to be the included species of a genus the name of which is first published in a generic synonymy. To take an example: (1) an author validly established a genus "*A-us*" with (say) 20 included species,

(2) a later author dealing with the same genus cites in it 10 species, of which some were different from those cited by the original author and in addition cited the unpublished generic name "*Y-us*" in the synonymy of *X-us*. The question is: (a) are the originally included species for *Y-us* the 20 species placed in *A-us* by its original author or (b) are the 10 species placed in that genus by the latter author alone to be regarded as the originally included species? I think it important that we should give a clear answer to this question. I recommend answer (a): for the later author clearly regarded the MS. name as equal in content with the genus as originally established.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the Commission,  
Paris.

25th July, 1948.



## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

PAPER  
I.C.(48)19

## PARTICULARS RELATING TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUAL CASES

*Memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission*

In the present Paper I submit particulars relating to certain individual cases which have been before the Commission for some time and on which I desire to have their opinion.

(1) *Proposed completion of "Opinions" which fail to provide complete answers to questions submitted:* One of the defects of a number of the older *Opinions* is that they provide an answer to part only of the question submitted. I have been in correspondence with Professor Harold Kirby on the subject of *Opinion* 95 (in which 3 out of 5 generic names in the Phylum Protozoa submitted for inclusion in the *Official List* were "tabled" for further consideration, which they never received) and Commissioner Boschma has raised the question of supplementing the incomplete decision given in *Opinion* 82 (see Point No. (2) below). I suggest that the Secretary to the Commission be instructed to examine the past *Opinions* with a view to ascertaining all instances where part of an application was not dealt with, and to submit proposals for completing these *Opinions* as soon as possible. (Z.N.(S)201).

(2) *Proposed addition of Calliphora Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Class Insecta Order Diptera) to the "Official List"* (reference *Opinion* 82): One instance of the type of omission referred to in Point (1) above has been raised by Commissioner Boschma (Z.N.(S)201). In the application dealt with in *Opinion* 82, the Commission were asked to take a two-fold action as regards each of two names of genera in the Order Diptera (Class Insecta). They were asked:—

- (A)(1) to validate the name *Musca* Linnaeus, 1758, with *Musca domestica* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species;
- (2) to place the name *Musca* Linnaeus, with the above species as type species, on the *Official List*;
- (B)(1) to validate the name *Calliphora* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, with *Musca vomitoria* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species; and
- (2) to place the name *Calliphora* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, with the above species, as type species on the *Official List*.

In *Opinion* 82 the Commission dealt only with the first of these four requests. It has since been ruled in connection with *Opinion* 137 that, where (as in the case of *Musca* Linn.) the Commission use their plenary powers to validate a given generic name or to fix its type species, this decision carries

with it automatically a decision to place on the *Official List* the name so validated, irrespective of whether the latter decision is recorded (as it should be) in the *Opinion* concerned. No further action is necessary therefore as regards request (A)(2) above.

The decision as regards *Musca* Linnaeus cleared away all difficulties as regards the name *Calliphora* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, and it is proposed that the Commission should now place that generic name (with *Musca vomitoria* Linnaeus, 1758, as type by original designation) on the *Official List*.

(3) *Type of Mabuya Fitzinger, 1826 (Class Reptilia) (reference Opinion 92)*: In *Opinion 92* in which the above name was placed on the *Official List*, the type species of the genus was erroneously cited as *Scincus sloanii* Daudin, 1803. This was due to a gross piece of carelessness, since the above species was not only not one of the species originally included in *Mabuya* by Fitzinger but was actually cited by that author in another genus on a different page of the same paper. Actually, *Lacertus mabouya* Lacépède, 1788, is the type of Fitzinger's genus by absolute tautonymy and is so recognised by specialists in this group. It is proposed to correct this mistake in the edition of the *Official List* shortly to be published. (Z.N.(S)203.)

(4) *Proposed use of the plenary powers for Porina Walker, 1856 (Order Lepidoptera)*: This name is of importance as this genus has a species which is a serious pasture pest in New Zealand. It is invalid, however, because it is pre-occupied by *Porina* d'Orbigny, 1852, the name for a genus of cretaceous Bryozoa. Recent species have also been referred to this genus which is regarded as one of the principal genera of Bryozoa. It would seem to me to be quite a wrong use of the plenary powers to employ them to validate a name in one part of the Animal Kingdom, if (as here) this means upsetting a well-known generic name in some other part of the Animal Kingdom. It appears to me, therefore, that the present application should be rejected and that the next name for "Porina," i.e., *Oxycanus*, Walker, 1856, should be used in its place, as in fact is already being done by some authors in New Zealand. It is suggested that concurrently with the rejection of the present application the name *Oxycanus* should be placed on the *Official List*. (Z.N.(S)194.)

(5) *Phlebotomus or Flebotomus (Class Insecta, Order Diptera)*: This name was published by Rondani in 1840 with an "F-" but was emended to "Ph-" by Agassiz in 1846. This emendation is in general, though not universal, use and it is generally agreed by the authorities who have approached the Commission (C. T. Brues; G. B. Fairchild; Marshall Hertig) that it would cause confusion if (as suggested by William F. Rapp, Jr.) the original "F-" spelling were to be re-adopted. It has been suggested by some of the Commission's correspondents that the original spelling was a *faute d'orthographe* or a *faute de transcription* or a *faute d'impression*. It is clear, however, from Rondani's paper that his spelling is intentional. This would indeed have been the natural spelling for an Italian to adopt, having regard to the Italian word "*Flebotomia*" (meaning "lancet"). If, therefore, the "Ph-" spelling is to be continued, the Commission will have to use their plenary powers to secure this end. In view of the very wide use

of this spelling in medical works and also of the views of specialists who have approached the Commission, it is suggested that action in this sense should be taken. The case was advertised last November and not a single objection has been raised against the adoption of this course. It is suggested that at the same time as the "Ph-" spelling is validated, this generic name should be placed on the *Official List* (type: *Bibio papatisi* Scopoli, 1786, by monotypy). (Z.N.(S.)169.)

(6) *Proposed use of the plenary powers to determine the identity of Papilio plexippus Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera)*: No final settlement will ever be reached on the question whether the above name was given to (1) the North American "Monarch" Danaid or (2) to the Chinese species of Danaid named *Papilio genutia* by Cramer, unless the Commission use their plenary powers to put an end to this controversy, for there are good arguments in support of either view (though personally I think those in favour of the "Monarch" to be the stronger of the two). Great confusion has arisen in this case, a fact which is particularly unfortunate (a) because of the large non-systematic literature regarding the "Monarch" (in relation to its migratory habits) and (b) because it is particularly objectionable to be in doubt regarding the identity of the type species of a genus (*Danaus* Kluk, 1802) which forms the basis of a family. I recommend that this problem which was submitted to the Commission by the late A. S. Corbet (British Museum (Natural History)) should now be settled by the use of the plenary powers to determine the matter by declaring that the species to which the name *Papilio plexippus* Linn. applies is the North American "Monarch" and not the Chinese species. This would be done by reference to some figure of the first of these species. (Z.N.(S.)323.)

(7) *Type species of Colymbus Linnaeus, 1750 (Class Aves)*: This case has been on the books of the Commission for over twenty years, and the only reason why it was not settled long ago was that, whatever decision was taken, it was certain that that decision would displease some section of ornithologists. As the result of this cowardly action on the part of the Commission, the situation has become more difficult, rather than less difficult. It is essential, therefore, that a decision should be taken with the least possible delay. Owing to the fact that there is a wide divergence of practice in this case, one group of workers taking as the type of this genus a species which is the type of one family and another group a species which is the type of another family, nothing would be gained by the use of the plenary powers. It seems to me, therefore, that the proper course is to determine definitely what is the type species of this genus under the *Règles* and to render an *Opinion* giving the answer. Owing to the divergence of practice referred to above, this is not a matter on which it is possible to obtain any material assistance from ornithologists, for all the specialists concerned are committed in their own work to one view or the other. It is accordingly proposed that, in view of the negative results obtained from the consultations carried out since the Lisbon Session of the Commission, the Secretary to the Commission should be instructed to prepare for the consideration of the Commission an objective statement of this case, together with his conclusion as to the type species of this genus on a strict application of the *Règles*, that an

immediate vote should be taken on this statement when it is available and that, on the completion of the voting, an *Opinion* setting out the decision of the Commission should be published, the genus *Colymbus* being at the same time placed on the *Official List*, with whatever species the Commission may have found to be the type under the *Règles*. (Z.N.(S.)78.) I recommend also that the Commission should place on record their disapproval of the use of delay as a means of avoiding difficult decisions and their determination in future to provide an answer without fear or favour in regard to every matter submitted to them for decision.

(8) *Schistosome worms and Schistosome monsters*: In 1832 Gurlt (*Lehrbuch der pathologischen Anatomie*) gave an account of the various types of Monsters and classified them in "genera" and "families" according to the Linnaean system. It is an obvious abuse of the Linnaean system of nomenclature for it to be applied to teratology in this way and it is proposed that the Commission should decide that for this reason the names of the so-called genera and species proposed for Monsters by Gurlt in 1832 (l.c.) have no standing in zoological nomenclature. The same applies to the name *Schistosoma reflexum* as used in the foregoing sense by Eisenbarthe in 1908 and to a similar use by Notter in 1927 (both of which latter papers have already unfortunately found their way into bibliographies of Schistosomiasis). (Z.N.(S.)285.)

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the Commission,  
Paris.

25th July, 1948.



## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

### PAPER

I.C. (48) 20

### DRAFT OF REPORT TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE CONGRESS BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

---

*Note by the Secretary to the Commission*

I circulate herewith for the consideration of my colleagues, the attached draft of the Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress for approval by the final *Concilium Plenum* to be held on Tuesday next, 27th July, 1948.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the Commission,  
Paris.

25th July, 1948.

EDITORIAL NOTE :—The text of the Report, as unanimously adopted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and similarly approved by the Section on Nomenclature on Monday, 26th July, 1948, will be published in volume 5 of the present journal. The chief differences between the draft as submitted with Commission Paper I.C.(48)20 and the text as unanimously approved and adopted are :—(1) the insertion of a new paragraph (paragraph 6) between the paragraphs numbered 5 and 6 in the draft, for the purpose of recording that at the later meetings of the Paris Session the International Commission reached decisions on a large number of applications on individual problems of zoological nomenclature, the subsequent paragraphs being renumbered accordingly ; (2) the insertion in paragraph 18 of the Report (paragraph 17 of the draft) of a reference to a change in the Danish representation on the Commission made subsequent to the preparation of the draft ; (3) the expansion into two paragraphs (paragraphs 20 and 21) of the description given in paragraph 19 of the draft of the arrangements proposed to be made to fill vacancies in the Commission consequent upon the expiry of the term of service of members of the Commission, the purpose of these changes being (a) to make a consequential correction in regard to the Danish representation on the Commission and (b) to explain the arrangements agreed upon in substitution for the existing system of three 9-year Classes ; (4) the redrafting of paragraph 45 of the draft (paragraph 47 of the Report as adopted) for the purpose (a) of recording a decision then agreed upon that the title of the proposed new " Official List " of names of species should be changed to that of " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " and (b) of expanding the reference to this " Official List " in order to make it comparable with that given in the preceding paragraph (paragraph 44 of the draft) which related to the existing " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ; (5) the redrafting of paragraph 47 of the draft (paragraph 49 of the Report as finally adopted) for the purpose of recording a decision then taken that the task of examining the draft of the *Règles* as revised by the Paris Congress, when that draft was received from the jurists, should be entrusted not to the Executive Committee of the Commission, as previously agreed, but to an *ad hoc* Editorial Committee of three members.

**DRAFT OF REPORT**  
**BY THE**  
**INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**  
**TO THE**  
**THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY**

---

**INTRODUCTORY**

We, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, assembled in Paris in July, 1948, have the honour to submit to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology the following Report in which we deal both with the developments which have occurred in the work of the Commission since our last meeting held at Lisbon in 1935 during the Twelfth International Congress and with the decisions of outstanding importance which have been reached during the present Congress by the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature.

2. The present Report is divided into three parts. In the first of these parts we deal with changes which have occurred in the composition of the Commission since 1935 and we ask for the covering approval of the Congress for the measures taken on our behalf by the Executive Committee during and since the war to secure the continued existence of the Commission as a body. In the same section, we submit important proposals which we have agreed upon during the present Congress for the introduction of certain changes in the composition of the Commission and the method to be followed in electing zoologists to be members of the Commission, together with consequential changes which we are agreed it is necessary should be introduced into our procedure. The combined effect of these changes will, we are confident, secure to the Commission an unassailably representative and international character which will greatly heighten its moral authority as the body which has been entrusted by the Congress with final authority for all matters relating to the regulation of international law in the field of zoological nomenclature.

3. In Part 2 of our Report we indicate very briefly the administrative and financial developments which have marked the period since the close of the Lisbon Congress thirteen years ago. It is not possible within the compass of the present Report adequately to deal with the many important innovations introduced during this period. We have therefore thought it valuable to submit with the present Report a detailed Report which has been prepared by our Secretary, Commissioner Francis Hemming.

4. In Part 3 of the present Report, we turn to the position of the *Règles Internationales* and indicate in broad outline the far-reaching reforms which we now recommend should be introduced. These proposals are based upon extensive consultations with representative zoological institutions and with leading specialists in many groups, both in the Old World and the New. The plan now submitted constitutes by far the most extensive and significant contribution to the advancement of zoological nomenclature since the adoption of the *Règles* at the meeting of the Congress held in Berlin in 1901. The successful issue of our discussions at the present Congress is due very largely to the great interest displayed in matters of nomenclature by many members of the present Congress and to the scientific and objective spirit which they have brought to the discussion of the many complex problems involved. To a considerable extent also this happy result is due to the decision of the Commission to throw its meetings open to all members of the Congress, thereby enlisting at every stage the accumulated knowledge and experience of a wide range of specialists in many fields. The Commission desire to thank all those who participated in their meetings for the valuable assistance and advice which they brought to the elaboration of the present plan.

5. The changes now proposed will enormously simplify the task of zoologists in applying the *Règles* in the course of their special studies and as such will be warmly welcomed by them. Everything in the *Règles* which experience has shown to be wisely conceived and of permanent value has been most carefully conserved. On the other hand, everything which is time-worn or obscure has been placed on one side and replaced by provisions which are clear, definite and explicit. The provisions agreed upon by the Commission which are now submitted for the approval of the Congress are designed to meet the expressed views of leading zoologists in all parts of the world and to further the attainment of that stability in nomenclature which it is the aim of every zoologist to secure.

## PART 1.

### DEVELOPMENTS IN THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION DURING THE PERIOD 1935-1948, AND PROPOSALS DESIGNED TO SECURE FOR THE COMMISSION THE MOST TRULY REPRESENTATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL CHARACTER AND TO ENDOW THAT BODY WITH THE HIGHEST MEASURE OF MORAL AUTHORITY

#### (a) Changes in the composition of the Commission since 1935

6. *Losses through death and resignation.* Deaths and resignations through ill-health have, as was to be expected, led to heavy losses in the membership of the Commission since its meeting held at Lisbon thirteen years ago.

7. We have lost through death no less than seven of our colleagues, Commissioners Fantham, Stone, Stiles, Stejneger, Chapman, Arndt, and Pellegrin. Every one of the colleagues whom we have lost made a valuable contribution to the work of the Commission during his period of office, and we deeply regret—as we do not doubt the Congress will also regret—that they

should have passed from among us. We feel bound to express a particular sense of loss arising from the death of our Vice-President, Commissioner Charles Wardell Stiles (U.S.A.), who at the time of his death had served continuously as a member of the Commission for forty-five years, during thirty-eight of which he had held the office of Secretary, and of Commissioner Leonhard Stejneger (U.S.A.), who served as a member of the Commission for forty-four years, and by his wide experience and judicial temperament had made a most notable contribution to the work of the Commission.

8. We feel bound also to express our particular regret at the death of Commissioner Walther Arndt (Germany) who lost his life during the war in circumstances which constitute an inefaceable outrage against the whole body of men of science. Denounced to the Gestapo apparently for no other reason than his intellectual integrity and his attachment to the conception of co-operation between scientific men, irrespective of nationality, Commissioner Arndt, the most gentle and inoffensive of men, was hurriedly arrested in January 1944 and shortly afterwards suffered death by the headsman's axe. We deeply deplore the loss which we have sustained as the result of this abominable crime and we ask the Congress to join with us in emphatically condemning this disgraceful murder.

9. In addition we have lost four other Commissioners through other causes. Three Commissioners (Apstein, Silvestri, Bolivar) have resigned on account of advancing years and ill-health or for other reasons, while Commissioner Jaczewski (Poland) has been unable to continue to discharge his duties as a Commissioner as the result of circumstances arising out of the late war, and his place has accordingly been treated as having been vacated.

10. *Election of Commissioner Francis Hemming to be Secretary to the Commission.* At the close of the Lisbon Congress in 1935, the post of Secretary to the Commission was vacant, Commissioner C. W. Stiles having resigned that Office but no election of a successor having been made. A year later, in October, 1936, Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) was unanimously elected to be Secretary to the Commission and the headquarters of the Commission were accordingly transferred from Washington to London.

11. *Steps taken to fill vacancies.* In accordance with the powers conferred on them by the Congress at their meeting held at Monaco in 1913, the Commission have taken the following steps to fill the vacancies which have arisen in their body and they ask for the approval of the Congress for the action so taken:

(1) *Elections in 1937.*

Senhor A. do Amaral (Brazil) *vice* Dr. A. Handlirsch (Austria);  
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) *vice* Dr. Geza Horváth (Hungary);  
Dr. Walther Arndt (Germany) *vice* Professor Karl Apstein (Germany).

(2) *Elections in 1939.*

Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Italy) *vice* Professor F. Silvestri (Italy);  
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) *vice* Dr. H. B. Fantham (Canada);  
Dr. T. Jaczewski (Poland) *vice* Dr. C. Bolivar y Pieltain.



(3) *Elections during the War.*

Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) *vice* Dr. Witmer Stone (U.S.A.) ;  
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) *vice* Dr. Leonhard Stejneger  
(U.S.A.) ; Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) *vice* Dr. C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.) ;  
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) *vice* Dr. Frederick Chapman (Australia).

(4) *Elections since the end of the War.*

Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) *vice* Dr. W. Arndt (Germany) ;  
Dr. Th. Mortensen (Denmark) *vice* Professor Jacques Pellegrin (France);  
Dr. Paul Rode (France) *vice* Dr. T. Jaczewski (Poland).

12. We ask the Congress to approve and confirm the elections set forth above.

13. At the same time we have to report that, in accordance with the powers delegated to us by the Congress, we took steps, as each of the Classes of which the body of the Commission is composed completed its term of service, to replace it with a new Class and to elect to that Class the retiring members of the time-expired Class. The Classes so constituted were : Class 1946 *vice* Class 1937 ; Class 1949 *vice* Class 1940 ; Class 1952 *vice* Class 1943 ; Class 1955 *vice* Class 1946. We ask the Congress to approve and confirm the action so taken.

14. *German and Japanese representation on the Commission.* At our present meeting we have reviewed the action taken in this matter as respects two Commissioners, namely Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) and Professor Rudolf Richter (Germany). We have a high regard for the professional eminence of both of these colleagues and value the important services which they have rendered to the Commission during their term of office. We feel, however, that in the circumstances arising out of the late war, we should be correctly reflecting the general sentiment of zoologists as a whole in recommending that the zoologists of Japan and Germany respectively should now be given an opportunity of deciding for themselves whether their present representation should remain unchanged or whether it would be their wish to nominate other zoologists to represent them. We accordingly recommend to the Congress that they should release Professor Esaki and Professor Richter from service as members of the Commission and should declare their places to be rendered vacant.

15. *Re-election of the Officers of the Commission during the War.* We have also to report that on the expiry of the term of service of the Class 1940, the Offices of President and Secretary fell vacant owing to the completion of their terms of service by Commissioners Karl Jordan and Francis Hemming, while three years later the office of Vice-President similarly fell vacant consequent upon the completion of the term of service of Class 1943 of which Commissioner James Lee Peters was a member. In each case we invited the retiring officer to resume his functions for a further period, being convinced that this would be in accordance with the wishes of the Congress. We ask that our action in this matter be approved and confirmed.

16. *Attendance of Commissioners at present meeting*: Five members of the Commission have attended the present Session of meetings: namely Commissioners Hemming, di Caporiacco, Bradley, Boschma and Rode. The remaining members, including our President and Vice-President, were unavoidably prevented from being present. In the absence of the President and Vice-President, our meetings during the present session have been presided over by our Secretary, Commissioner Francis Hemming.

17. *Election of Alternate Members of the Commission for the duration of the Congress*: In accordance with the power conferred upon the Commission by the Congress at its meeting held at Budapest in 1927, we invited the under-mentioned members of the Congress to serve as Alternate Members of the Commission during our present Paris Session:

Señor Enrique Beltrán (Mexico) *vice* Señor A. Cabrera (Argentina).

Dr. Edward Hindle (United Kingdom) *vice* Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom).

Professor Arturo Ricardo Jorge (Portugal) *vice* Senhor A. do Amaral (Brazil).

Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.) *vice* Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.).

Professor Kamel Mansour (Egypt) *vice* Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary).

Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.) *vice* Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.).

Mr. Norman D. Riley (United Kingdom) *vice* Dr. W. T. Calman (United Kingdom).

Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) *vice* Dr. Th. Mortensen (Denmark).

Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium) *vice* Professor Rudolf Richter (Germany)

Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.) *vice* Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.).

18. We desire to express our sense of indebtedness to the foregoing zoologists for consenting to assist us by serving as Alternate Members of the Commission and for the long hours which many of them have devoted to our proceedings, often at considerable personal inconvenience and always at the cost of not participating in other activities of the Congress.

19. *Formation of Class 1958 vice Class 1949*: The Class 1949 expires on the last day of the present Congress and we recommend that the following four members of that Class should be elected to be members of the new Class 1958:—Cabrera, Hemming, Jordan, Pearson. Much to our regret our old friend and colleague Dr. Th. Mortensen has asked to be permitted to retire from the service of the Commission on account of ill-health and we feel unable to resist his request in this matter. We recommend that he should be replaced by Professor Dr. R. Spärck (Denmark) who, as already reported (paragraph 17), has acted during the present Congress as an Alternate Member in place of Dr. Mortensen. The sixth place in this Class should, we recommend, be left vacant until such time as information is available regarding the wishes of German zoologists on the question of their representation on the Commission.

20. *Resignation of President Karl Jordan*: It is with the deepest regret and with a profound sense of loss that we have received a letter from our President, Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom), expressing the hope that, having regard to his age and to the fact that he is now totally deaf, he may be released from the duties of President of the Commission. Dr. Jordan has been a Member

of the Commission continuously for a period of thirty-five years during nineteen of which he held the office of President, having been elected thereto in 1929. consequent upon the death of the eminent Italian zoologist, the late Professor F. S. Monticelli. Throughout his long term of office, Dr. Jordan has brought to the service of the Commission a wealth of knowledge, a wisdom of counsel, and a high sense of judicial impartiality which have been of the greatest value to the Commission. In particular, the Commission owe to Dr. Jordan a special debt of gratitude for the devotion which he has brought to his duties as our President and to the judgment with which he has guided our labours during many difficult periods. We sincerely regret that Dr. Jordan has found it necessary to take the present decision and we thank him most warmly for the eminent services which, while President of the Commission, he has rendered to zoological nomenclature. Our regret would be all the keener were it not for the fact that Dr. Jordan has felt able to accede to our request that, although no longer our President, he should continue to serve as a member of our body. We feel that it will be the unanimous wish of the Congress, as it is of the Commission, that a special tribute should be paid to our old friend and colleague and we have therefore great pleasure in recommending the Congress, as an exceptional measure, to establish the post of Honorary Life President of the Commission and to offer this post to our retiring President.

21. *Proposed election of Vice-President James Lee Peters to be President :* We unanimously recommend that our Vice-President, Dr. James Lee Peters (U.S.A.), be elected President of the Commission in succession to Dr. Karl Jordan. Dr. Peters is well known not only to us but also to a wide body of zoologists and we feel confident that in his hands the impartiality and dignity of the Presidency of the Commission will be upheld and maintained.

22. *Proposed election of Commissioner A. do Amaral to be Vice-President of the Commission :* We have pleasure in recommending that the vacancy caused by the election of Dr. Peters to be President should be filled by the election of Dr. A. do Amaral (Brazil) to be Vice-President of the Commission.

23. *Proposed re-election of Commissioner Francis Hemming to be Secretary to the Commission :* The term of office of Commissioner Francis Hemming as Secretary to the Commission expires on the last day of the present Congress consequent on the expiry of the period of service of the Class 1949. We recommend that Commissioner Hemming should be re-elected to this Office for a further period.

24. *Office of Assistant Secretary :* We recommend that this Office should be allowed to lapse as an office to be held by a member of the Commission and should be made available for the chief Assistant to the Secretary in the Bureau of the Commission.

**(b) Proposed enlargement of the Commission and introduction of changes in the manner of nominating members of the Commission**

25. We recommend that in order to provide an opportunity for any country in which any considerable amount of zoological work is being done to be represented or for the election of any zoologist of outstanding qualities who

would be pre-eminently suitable to be a member of the Commission, the membership of the Commission should be enlarged, there being in future no upper limit to the number of members, the present number of 18 being retained as a minimum. We propose also that certain safeguards should be introduced to secure that there shall at all times be an appropriate balance in the membership of the Commission as between different parts of the world and as between different types of knowledge and experience both in the field of systematic zoology (including palaeozoology) and in those of the applied sciences which are concerned with organisms belonging to the Animal Kingdom.

26. We recommend also that certain changes should be made in the manner by which zoologists may be proposed for election as members of the Commission. We think it necessary that the Commission should retain the right and the duty of itself inviting individual zoologists in certain cases to serve as members of the Commission, but we consider also that, parallel with this method of selection, there should be introduced a system by which the views of zoologists in any particular country should be sought, through appropriate channels, in regard to the selection of a zoologist of their country to be their national representative on the Commission.

27. We have discussed both these proposals at a meeting held jointly with the Section of Nomenclature which is in full agreement with the line of development which we advocate. We do not consider it necessary therefore to set out here the detailed machinery by which we propose that the new scheme should be operated, for we feel that it will be the wish of the Congress that matters of this kind should be settled in the Section on Nomenclature and that only the broad outlines of the scheme should be brought to the attention of the Congress in plenary Session. Full particulars of both schemes will however be recorded in the minutes both of the Commission and of the Section for purposes of record.

28. We ask for the approval of the Congress for the proposed enlargement of the Commission and for the changes in the method to be followed in the election of members of the Commission outlined above.

#### (c) The procedure of the Commission

29. In consequence of the recommendations for the enlargement of the Commission submitted in the preceding paragraph, changes are needed in the procedure of the Commission. Further, even if no change had been proposed in the size of the Commission, we should have felt bound to ask the Congress to withdraw the rule by which in certain types of case absolute unanimity is required at present, for experience has shown that the *Liberum Veto* is a definite hindrance to the work of the Commission and is open to strong objection, quite apart from the objections generally entertained towards this outworn rule of voting. The Commission consider, however, that as regards cases involving either the suspension of the *Règles* or a proposed amendment to the *Règles* a more rigorous rule of voting should be required than should be necessary to secure the approval of the Commission on other matters. In their present



proposals therefore the Commission have made provision for a distinction of this kind, the more rigorous of the two standards requiring (1) that as a minimum one quarter of the membership of the Commission shall record their votes, and (2) that two out of every three votes cast shall be in favour of the action proposed.

30. We have discussed our proposals in detail with the Section on Nomenclature by whom they are approved and supported. Full particulars will be given in the minutes of the meetings both of the Commission and of the Section. We believe that in view of the heavy calls upon its time the Congress will regard the foregoing summary as adequate for their purposes and we accordingly invite the Congress to give their approval to the plan for the reform of the Commission's procedure proposed by the Commission and unanimously approved by the Section on Nomenclature.

31. We should add that we have decided also upon various administrative reforms which will, we believe, greatly reduce the period required to obtain an *Opinion* from the Commission on any given question of nomenclature and thus materially enhance the value to zoologists of the work of the Commission.

## PART 2.

### ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENTS DURING THE PERIOD

1936-1948

32. The detailed Report prepared by our Secretary, Commissioner Francis Hemming, which, as already explained (paragraph 3 above), we propose to lay before the Congress, gives a full account of the administrative and financial developments which have occurred in the work of the Commission during the period from October, 1936 (when Commissioner Hemming was elected to be Secretary to the Commission), up to the opening of the present Congress. It will be sufficient, therefore, if here we confine ourselves to the briefest outline of these developments. We think it necessary, however, to include this short summary, partly because the Congress is entitled to be informed of the work of the Commission during the long interval which has elapsed since its last meeting and partly because we wish to take the opportunity of expressing our concurrence in the various developments in question and of securing the approval of the Congress for the action taken.

33. The principal developments which we have to report are as follows :

- (1) A critical situation arose immediately upon the transfer of the Secretariat of the Commission to London, since at that time the Commission possessed no funds at all and was naturally unable to look for the assistance which, while located in Washington, it had received from the Smithsonian Institution. At the outset, therefore, it was necessary to raise a small fund from leading scientific institutions in the United Kingdom and the United States.

- (2) By June, 1939, the Secretariat had been firmly established at its new headquarters and the publication of *Opinions* directly by the Commission itself began in August of that year.
- (3) The outbreak of war in September, 1939, put a temporary stop to the work of the Commission, as, owing to the threat of air raids on London, it was thought best to evacuate the records of the Commission to a place of safety in the country. In the summer of 1942 these records were brought back to London and the work of the Secretariat was resumed.
- (4) No new nomenclatorial decisions could be taken during the war owing to the interruption of all communications between the Secretariat in London and those members of the Commission who were nationals of Germany and the countries associated with her and also with those members of the Commission who were nationals of countries then in German occupation. There was however at that time a large number of applications on which decisions had already been taken and also a certain number on which every Commissioner had had an opportunity of voting but on which the voting had not been completed. It was accordingly decided first to prepare and publish *Opinions* on all the cases falling in the first of these classes and second to secure enough additional votes from the available Commissioners to complete the cases that were still incomplete.
- (5) The publication of *Opinions* was re-started in October, 1942, and continued steadily until all the decisions taken at Lisbon had been formally rendered by the issue of 48 *Opinions* and 3 *Declarations*. In addition, during the same period 13 *Opinions* were completed and published and *Declarations* 1 to 9 and *Opinions* 1 to 16 were republished, the earlier edition having become out of print. The titles of all these publications are given in Commissioner Hemming's detailed Report. In all, 3 *Declarations* and 61 *Opinions* have been rendered and published since the outbreak of war, the total number rendered to date amounting to 12 *Declarations* and 194 *Opinions*.
- (6) In 1943 the Commission established a journal, the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, as a medium for the publication of the texts of applications submitted for decision, thereby providing an opportunity for zoologists all over the world to ascertain what proposals are before the Commission at any given time and to comment thereon before any decision is taken by the Commission.
- (7) An appeal for a fund of £1,800 was issued in 1943 and a number of generous donations was received in response.
- (8) Nevertheless, the financial position of the Commission remained extremely precarious, even though all the work of the Secretariat was done for the Commission by an unpaid spare-time Secretary and the Secretariat itself was housed in the Secretary's house.
- (9) In 1947 U.N.E.S.C.O. came forward with a generous offer of a conditional grant of £10,600 and a similar grant (also conditional) has been made for the current year.

- (10) In 1947 also a Corporation was formed under United Kingdom law under the title "International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature", which took over from the Commission the responsibility for the conduct of its financial affairs. This was essential, for only by this means could the Commission's financial affairs be placed upon an assured basis.

34. The immediate difficulties have been relieved by the grant made by U.N.E.S.C.O. but the central problem facing the Commission and the Congress remains unsolved. For the volume of work passing through the Secretariat of the Commission has grown so greatly that a whole-time permanent Secretary is required, it being beyond the capacity of any honorary Secretary who (like the present one) can devote only his spare time to the work of the Commission, his day time being necessarily taken up with earning a livelihood. Such an appointment cannot be made until the Commission has an assured income of \$25,000 to \$30,000 a year, or some two and a half times as great as the grant received from U.N.E.S.C.O. during the past year. In the meantime the Commission must do the best it can with the help of a spare-time Secretary who, by providing his services free, heavily subsidises the Commission and gives it an air of financial soundness which it does not possess.

35. It is the intention of the Commission to seek additional means of financial support, for it realises how easy it would be for a situation to arise in which with its present income it would be impossible for it to continue its work. The situation is extremely difficult and is a source of constant anxiety. It will not be remedied until the leading zoological institutions of the world, realising (as they already do) that the Commission is an institution, the continued existence of which is essential for their work, take steps to provide the Commission with an assured income sufficient to enable it to provide the service in regard to nomenclature which is essential to all zoologists and which it alone is in a position to offer.

### PART 3.

#### THE PROPOSED CODIFICATION AND AMENDMENT OF THE "RÈGLES"

36. At the present time the state of international law in respect to zoological nomenclature is extremely unsatisfactory, zoologists having to rely on the one hand upon the *Règles* adopted nearly 50 years ago and now in serious need of re-examination and on the other hand upon an ill-digested mass of case law built up over more than 40 years in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission.

37. Inspired by a desire to make an advance towards substituting order for the present chaos, the Commission drew up plans prior to the opening of the present Congress for the incorporation into the *Règles* of the interpretative decisions already given by the Commission in *Opinions*, for the settlement of a number of important individual nomenclatorial problems which were either not dealt with in the *Règles* or were there dealt with in a piece-meal, incoherent and obscure fashion and for the incorporation in the *Règles* of a number of long overdue minor corrections, clarifications and additions. On assembling in

Paris, we quickly found that the general temper of zoologists attending the Congress was strongly in favour of a more thorough-going reform than had previously seemed practicable. Encouraged by these favourable conditions, the Commission have devoted every effort to securing the maximum benefit from the present Congress and now, after holding fourteen meetings during a period of five working days, have drawn up a far-reaching but carefully balanced scheme of reform.

38. *Codification of the "Opinions" relating to the "Règles"*: We have drawn up, and the Section on Nomenclature has approved, a plan for the immediate incorporation into the *Règles* (subject to certain exceptions and modifications) of all the interpretations of various of its Articles which have been given by the Commission at different times. We recommend also the incorporation into the *Règles* of the important resolutions of a more general character, which are embodied in certain of the Commission's *Declarations*. It is part of our purpose that on their incorporation into the *Règles*, the *Opinions* and *Declarations* on which the newly incorporated provisions are based, should be repealed and cancelled for all except historical purposes.

39. *The problem of the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire"*: This problem, which gave rise to such serious difficulties at Padua in 1930, was (as the Congress will recall) referred back to the Commission in 1935 by the President of the Section on Nomenclature, to whom the matter had been submitted by the *Comité Permanent*. During the present meeting we have unanimously adopted a Report in which (1) we find that the foregoing expression as at present used in the *Règles* has a meaning exactly equivalent to that of the expression "nomenclature binominale" and (2) we recommend that, subject to certain safeguards for generic names published by non-binominal authors, the expression "nomenclature binominale" should now be incorporated in the *Règles* in place of the expression "nomenclature binaire". We submitted this Report to the President of the Section on Nomenclature by whom it was laid before the Section. It is a matter of great satisfaction to us that the Section gave their unanimous approval to our Report, which is accordingly submitted to the Congress for final approval.

40. *Three major problems of zoological nomenclature*: We have submitted detailed reports to the Section on Nomenclature on three major problems of zoological nomenclature, of which the first is at present dealt with in the *Règles* in a manner contrary to the general wishes of zoologists, the second is dealt with so obscurely and incompletely that the present state of the law is open to the greatest doubt, while the third deals with a question on which the *Règles* are absolutely silent. These questions are:

- (1) the meaning of the expression "indication" as used in proviso (a) to Article 25;
- (2) the rules relating to homonymy in specific and subspecific trivial names;
- (3) the problem of names for forms of less than subspecific rank.



41. On our proposals for dealing with each of these important questions the Section on Nomenclature has expressed its unanimous and enthusiastic support.

42. *Miscellaneous amendments in, additions to, and clarifications of, the "Règles"*: We have submitted a large number of proposals for amending the *Règles*, for making additions thereto and for inserting clarifications in regard to passages which were either obscure or badly drafted. These proposals also have been warmly acclaimed by the Section on Nomenclature.

43. *Incorporation in the "Règles" of decisions at present embodied in "Opinions" and the consequential repeal of the "Opinions" in question*: We propose that all decisions in regard to individual names should be incorporated in Schedules to be attached to the *Règles* and that, when this has been done, the *Opinions* in question should be repealed and cancelled except for historical purposes. In the case of the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", we propose that the Schedule concerned should be issued separately as a companion volume to the actual *Règles*. The reform constituted by this plan will afford an immense relief to zoologists and naturally therefore won for itself warm support in the Section on Nomenclature.

44. *"Official List of Generic Names in Zoology"*: In view of the very widespread wish expressed both inside and outside the Section on Nomenclature that the *Official List* should be used as a means of promoting stability in nomenclature, we agreed to recommend that the status of names on the *Official List* should be enhanced by providing that, even if a name is found to have been placed on the *List* in error, it should remain the correct name for the genus in question unless and until the Commission shall otherwise direct. In view of the enhanced status now to be given to all names on the *Official List*, the Commission hope that specialists will be stimulated to co-operate actively in securing the addition to the *Official List* of all the more important generic names in the groups with which they are concerned, thereby achieving a far-reaching measure of stability in the nomenclature of the groups in question.

45. *The "Official List of Specific Names in Zoology"*: The establishment of an "Official List of Specific Names in Zoology" is an essential corollary to the existing *Official List* of generic names and we recommend that such a List should now be established. The Section on Nomenclature, realising the importance of this question, warmly supports our proposal in this matter.

46. *The "pleins pouvoirs" to suspend the "Règles" granted to the Commission by the Congress in 1913*: We propose that the "pleins pouvoirs" Resolution of 1913 shall be amended in various respects to meet the requirements of the changes in procedure recommended in the earlier part of the present Report (paragraph 30). We propose also that words should be added to make it clear that these powers are intended for use, especially, *inter alia*, (1) to preserve names of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science and horticulture and in the teaching of zoology at universities and elsewhere, (2) to

prevent existing nomenclatorial practice from being thrown into confusion by the uncertainty of *longerum* words or of *longorum* names or well-known words, and (3) to standardize the application of well-known names there, in the absence of such prescription by the Commission, in a way that it would always be a matter of course to value at two or more species a given name is properly applicable under the *Reges*. Of these proposals, the first two were suggested to us by the Section on Nomenclature, while the third, which we put forward ourselves, secured immediately the unanimous support of the Section. Finally we recommended that this resolution, as amended above, should now be incorporated in the *Reges*, in order to make it clear to every zoologist that the provisions suggested therein are of force and weight equal to that of any of the provisions of the *Reges*. In this matter also we have the full-hearted support of the Section on Nomenclature.

47. The proposition of the adoption of French text of the *Reges* is now proposed as amended. The need of revising the substantive French text of the *Reges* will become better technical questions, the solution of which will call for the assistance of experts. The Commission have accordingly proposed to the Section on Nomenclature, and the Section has agreed, on the following course of procedure. The record of the decisions of the Congress in so far as these relate to changes in the *Reges* together with the supporting memoranda in which these decisions were based, should be referred to panels with instructions to prepare the draft of the new substantive French text together with a literal English translation, and that these two drafts should then be circulated to the Secretary or such member of the Commission to provide him with an opportunity for examining the texts to ensure that they faithfully embody the decisions of the Congress, and neither add anything to, nor omit anything from these decisions. At the end of three calendar months from the date of the texts being so circulated, any comments falling within the above head should, we recommend, be referred to the Executive Committee for decision. When any such matters have been decided, the *Reges*, as amended, should be promulgated with the least possible delay.

48. The revised *Reges* should, we propose, enter into force as from the date on which they are published. We anticipate, however, that it will be possible, at a considerably earlier date, to publish in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* the minutes of the meetings of the Commission at its Paris Session and we propose that the Congress should recommend all zoologists hereafter to take as their guide the record of the Paris decisions as contained in these minutes during the, as we hope, short period which will elapse between the publication of the Paris minutes and the formal promulgation of the revised *Reges*.

49. *Conclusion*. The Paris meeting of the Commission marks a turning-point in the history of zoological nomenclature, for the Commission, with the active support of the Section on Nomenclature, has now carried through a complete codification of the law as it stood at the opening of the Congress and has also put forward new proposals of the greatest importance and value on questions which previously found no mention in the *Reges* or only provisions of

the most inadequate character. At the same time, as part of the process of codification, nearly one quarter of the body of *Opinions* has been deprived of all but a historical interest and this process will be virtually completed on the publication of the *Règles* as amended at the present meeting and of the volume containing the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. Finally, the status of that List has been materially enhanced and with it the prospect of securing stability in generic nomenclature. As for the trivial names of species, an important advance in the direction of standardisation has been achieved by the decision to establish for such names an *Official List* parallel to that already in existence for generic names.

50. Much remains to be done, but with the help of the revised *Règles* adopted at the present Congress zoologists will be in an incomparably better position to judge in which directions further improvements are still required than if they had still to thread their way through the maze of independent decisions by which hitherto they have had to guide themselves in their daily work. The Commission are determined that, so far as it lies in their power to prevent it, zoologists shall never again be required to struggle with an unsorted mass of decisions built up over a long period. To this end, the Commission have decided, and they now give their assurance to the Congress, that at each subsequent meeting of the Congress they will submit recommendations for the incorporation in the *Règles* of any conclusions which they may have reached since the previous meeting of the Congress, so that by thus harvesting the results of their work, they may be able at every such meeting to secure that every zoologist shall be able to find within the covers of a single volume a full, detailed and authoritative record of the entire body of international law in zoological nomenclature.

51. The Paris Congress of 1948 has been a meeting of outstanding achievement in the field of zoological nomenclature and it is fitting that this achievement should have been secured in the same city as that in which almost 60 years ago the first important steps were taken to establish an international code of nomenclature for living creatures.

52. In submitting our Report to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, we desire to express in the warmest terms our sense of gratitude for the interest, help and support which we have throughout received at the hands both of our French hosts and of all other members of the Congress and to place on record our conviction that it is to this spirit of co-operation and the strength which it gives that must be attributed the outstanding results achieved.

## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

PAPER  
I.C. (48) 21

PRESS COMMUNIQUÉ ISSUED AT THE CLOSE OF THE THIRTEENTH  
INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY,  
PARIS, 21st—27th JULY, 1948

---

*Note by the Secretary to the Commission*

In view of the far-reaching decisions in regard to zoological nomenclature taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, it was clearly of great importance that an authoritative summary of those decisions should be issued to the scientific press of the world at the earliest possible moment. Accordingly, I spent part of yesterday afternoon in preparing the draft of a communiqué to be issued to the press by the Commission for this purpose. I took copies of this draft with me to the final banquet of the Congress last night and submitted it for approval to as many of the members of the Commission as I could find. In this way I was able to obtain the comments of the majority of the members (including Alternate Members) of the Commission who had taken part in our discussions during the past week. The majority of the members consulted approved the draft as it stood, but some were kind enough to offer various suggestions of a drafting or verbal character. So far as possible, I have adopted these suggestions and have incorporated them in the text now prepared for release to the press.

2. I circulate herewith for the information of my colleagues a copy of the communiqué in the form in which it is being issued.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the Commission,  
Paris.

28th July, 1948.

EDITORIAL NOTE:—For the text of the Communiqué referred to above, see Volume 5 of the present journal.



**PART 2.**

**COMMUNICATIONS SUBMITTED  
TO THE  
SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE,  
THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS  
OF ZOOLOGY,  
PARIS, JULY, 1948**

## UN POINT DE NOMENCLATURE.

DOIT-ON DIRE *PSODOS* ET NON PAS *PSOLOS* TR. (LEP. GEOMETRIDAE) ?

Par H. BERTHET (France)

(Commission's Reference Z.N. (S.)362)

En grec 'ΟΨΟΛΟΣ veut dire la fumée, la suie, et il suffit d'examiner une collection de ce genre de Géométrides, ou à défaut de jeter les yeux sur les admirables planches de Culot, Vol. IV des " Noctuelles et Géomètres d'Europe " par exemple pour se rendre compte de ce que cette couleur de suie, de fumée est la teinte générale de toutes les espèces actuellement comprises dans le genre de Treitschke. De fait, il y a grande difficulté à se procurer ces différentes espèces dont la majorité ne vit qu'en haute montagne, voire au-dessus de 4.000 atteignant en France 4.100 m. sur des rochers presque inaccessibles, souvent dangereux à atteindre. où en tout cas il y a toujours péril à chasser au filet.

Si maintenant on se reporte au texte même de Treitschke au 6<sup>e</sup> tome des " Schmett. v. Eur. " (suite à l'ouvrage d'Ochsenheimer), p. 254 de la 1<sup>re</sup> édition, on lit au Gen. XCVII ce que je traduis littéralement : " La couleur de fond de ces papillons <sup>(1)</sup> est noire. Leur corps est d'un noir profond . . . " ; suit le nom donné : "*Psodos*, Πσόδος, aussi bien que σπόδιος couleur de cendre ". ajoute-t-il.

Or ce qui est exact pour σπόδιος est quant à ψodos un horrible barbarisme provenant d'un *lapsus calami*, erreur de copie ou de typographie, sinon de lecture par l'Econome du Théâtre Impérial de Vienne !

On peut aisément l'expliquer du fait que si l'on écrit le mot en majuscules, comme je l'ai fait en tête du présent article, ainsi qu'on le trouve sur certains dictionnaires, il suffit que le Δ lambda ait les deux tirets du bas des jambages un peu trop accusés ou empâtés, pour former Δ un delta très exactement.

Dans ces conditions, le Code zoologique le permettant dans son art. 19, je propose que le nom de ce genre soit rétabli dans sa propre forme correcte de la pensée de son auteur Treitschke et s'écrive *Psolos* Tr.

<sup>1)</sup> Les espèces comprises au temps de Treitschke dans ce genre étaient : *alpinata* Hbn. SV 197 (nec Scop.) = *quadrifaria* Sulzer 1776. C'est la première nommée et par conséquent le type du genre ; *torvaria* Hbn. = *tenebraria* Esp. 1806 qui est une *Orphne* Hbn. Autre désignation poétique de la couleur sombre, obscure, foncée.

*horridaria* Hbn. actuellement confondue avec la précédente.  
*venetaria* Hbn. qui faisait si jolie image rappelant la mantille noire des Vénitiennes avec ses broderies = *fusca* Thbg. (nec Hw.), qui est une *Pygmeana* Bdv. 1840.  
*trepidaria* Hbn. = *canaliculata* Hochw. 1785.

Ainsi les 2 espèces *quadrifaria* Sulz. = *alpinata* Hbn., qui est le type, et *canaliculata* Hochw. = *trepidaria* Hbn. sont les seules citées par Treitschke subsistant dans son genre *Psolos*, aucune n'ayant conservé le nom donné.

TWO PROPOSED ALTERATIONS IN THE RULES ON  
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

By HENNING LEMCHE (Denmark)

(Commission's Reference Z.N. (S.)359)

Proposal 1.

It is proposed that the provisions of the Resolution relating to the suspension of the Rules in certain cases should be amended to read as follows. The words proposed to be inserted in addition to, or in place of, existing words are printed in italics.

RESOLVED.—That plenary power is herewith conferred upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, acting for this Congress, to suspend the *Règles* as applied to any given case, where in its judgment the strict application of the *Règles* will clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity, provided, however, that no less than *half a year's* notice shall be given in the Bulletin of the Commission and in *some other selected, suitable journals*, that the question of a possible suspension of the *Règles* as applied to such case is under consideration, thereby making it possible for zoologists, particularly specialists in the group in question, to present arguments for or against the suspension under consideration, and provided, also, that the vote of the Commission is *at least a two-thirds majority of the full Commission*, and provided, further, *that if the vote is not a two-thirds majority, may it be for suspension or for application of the " Règles," the case is to be presented to the section on Nomenclature of the next International Congress of Zoologists, which after discussion of the case shall endow the Commission with the power to revise the case once more and then to make a final decision by simple majority.* This decision shall be without appeal; and

RESOLVED.—That the foregoing authority refers especially to cases of names of larval stages and the transference of names from one genus or species to another, but also to *any other case where the strict application of the " Règles " will clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity;* and

RESOLVED.—That the Congress fully approves the plan that has been inaugurated by the Commission of conferring with special committees from the special group involved in any given case, and that it authorises and instructs the Commission to continue and extend this policy, and *also, to present its votes as fast as possible without impairing the solicitude necessary for the decisions.*







## THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

---

## BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

**Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5**

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5:—

**Volume 1:** A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

**Volume 2:** This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

**Volume 3:** This volume will be devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

**Volume 4:** This volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948*. It is expected that publication of this volume will commence within the next few weeks.

**Volume 5:** At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948*, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

---

## INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses:—

**International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature:** 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

**International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:** Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.